DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 284 CS 504 617

AUTHOR Gronbeck, Bruce E., Ed.
TITLE The "Scholar's Anthology": Televisual Studies.
INSTITUTION Central States Speech Association.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 80p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT The Central States Speech Journal; v34 n3 Fall 1983

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; *Discourse Analysis; Feminism; Language Usage; News Reporting; *Production Techniques; *Programing (Broadcast); Radio; Religion; Speech Communication; *Television; *Television Research
IDENTIFIERS *Television Criticism

ABSTRACT

The five major articles in this journal issue focus on television criticism as an academic field. An introduction, entitled "The 'Scholar's Anthology': Televisual Studies" (Bruce Gronbeck), is followed by articles discussing the following topics: (1) the discourses of television quiz programs (John Fiske), (2) the dialectic of feminine power in the television serial "Dynasty" (Cathy Schwichtenberg), (3) metaphoric structures in political news stories (Dennis K. Mumby and Carole Spitzack), (4) Robert Schuller and American civil religion (Martha Solomon), and (5) the assassination of John Lennon and the advisory function of eulogies (Karen A. Foss). Two additional articles (one by Barbara S. Morris and Joel Nydahl, and the other by Douglas A. Boyd) discuss production elements of live television broadcasts and the United States government's reaction to "pirate" radio. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245284

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CSSA

TO TH. EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CEN.ER (ERIC)."

FEATURING:

A SCHOLAR'S ANTHOLOGY ON TELEVISUAL STUDIES, WITH ESSAYS BY

*John Fiske
*Cathy Schwichtenberg
*Dennis Mumby and Carole Spitzack
*Martha Solomon
*Karen Foss

TWO SPECIAL REPORTS ON BROADCASTING BY

*Barbra Morris and Joel Nydahl
*Douglas Boyd

Published by
The Central States
Speech Association

FALL 1983 Vol. 34 No. 3

CS SJ 34 3

THE CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL

Published by the Central States Speech Association

EDITOR:
BRUCE E. GRONBECK
Department of Communication and Theatre Arts
University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242

BOARD OF ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Rhetorical Studies
RAY D. DEARIN — Iowa State University
HOWARD H. MARTIN — University of Michigan
Communication Studies
RUTH ANNE CLARK — University of Illinois-Urbana
Applied and Educational Communication Studies
DOUGLAS M. TRANK — University of Iowa
Media Studies
GRETCHEN BARBATSIS — Michigan State University
Aesthetic Communication Studies
JOHN GRONBECK-TEDESCO — University of Kansas
Forensic Studies
DONN W. PARSON — University of Kansas

ASSISTANT EDITORS FOR 1983:

THOMAS BEISECKER — University of Kansas
PAUL H. BOASE — Ohio University
JOHN W. BOWERS — University of Iowa
THOMAS R. BURKEHOLDER — Iowa State University
BRANT BURLESON — Purdue University
RANDALL BYTWERK — Southern Illinois University
PAMELA COOPER — Northwestern University
RICHARD E. CRABLE — Purdue University
ROBERT FINDLAY — University of Kansas
JOSEPH M. FOLEY — Ohio State University
ELLEN REID GOLD — University of Kansas
ALVIN GOLDFARB — Illinois State University
JUDY G. HAMPLE — Western Illinois University
CAROL J. JABLONSKI — Indiana University
SALLY JACKSON — Michigan State University
JACK KAY — University of Nebraska
JO LISKA — Cleveland State University
JOHN R. LYNE — University of Iowa
JOHN J. MAKAY — Ohio State University
MICHAEL C. McGEE — University of Iowa
JAMES MEASELL — Wayne State University
KIMBERLY A. NEUENDORF — Cleveland State University
DONOVAN J. OCHS — University of Iowa
DANIEL J. O'KEEFE — University of Illinois-Urbana
EDWARD PAPPAS — Wayne State University
JUDY C. PEARSON — Ohio University
LINDA L. PUTNAM — Purdue University
ALLEN SCULT — Drake University
WILLIAM SEILER — University of Nebraska
J. ANN SELZER — University of Iowa
ALAN SILLARS — Ohio State University
KATHIE J. TURNER — University of Notre Dame-St. Mary's
JOSEPH TUROW — Purdue University
WALTER ULRICH — University of Alabama
WILLIAM E. WIETHOFF — Indiana University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS:

ELLIE CODER — University of Iowa

Copyright 1983 by the CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President
Mary Margaret Roberts
Department of Speech & Theatre
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, KS 66762

President-Elect and 1984 Program Planner
Dennis S. Gouran
Department of Speech Communication
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Executive Secretary
James F. Weaver
Department of Speech Communication
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011

Vice President and 1985 Program Planner
Edward J. Pappas
Department of Speech Communication, Theatre and Journalism
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI 48202

Past President
Donovan J. Ochs
Rhetoric Program
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Journal Editor
Bruce E. Gronbeck
Dept of Communication & Theatre Arts
230 Jessup Hall
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Advisory Committee, Chairperson
Donald B. Morlan
Department of Communication Arts
University of Dayton
Dayton, OH 45469

Executive Committeepersons At-Large

Goodwin F. Berquist
Department of Communication
205 Derby Hall
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Thomas D. Beisecker
Communication Studies—3090 Wescoe Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

CSSJ Business Manager
Ritch L. Sorenson
Department of Speech Communication
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chairperson: Don B. Morlan, University of Dayton, Ohio

Vice Chairperson: Thomas Kay, Marshall High School, Wisconsin

Secretary: Maxine P. Joyce, Macomb High School Illinois

Illinois: Thomas B. McClain, New Trier High School; Philip A. Gray, Northern Illinois University

Indiana: Diane M. Smith, North Posey High School; J. Jeffery Auer, Indiana University

Iowa: Douglas M. Trank, University of Iowa; Kenneth G. Butzier, Northern Iowa High School

Kansas: Richard Young, Hutchinson High School; Laura Meeks, Girard High School

Michigan: Gordon L. Thomas, Michigan State University; Wallace A. Mollema, Central Michigan University

Minnesota: Gretchen Heath, Cooper High School; Larry Schnoor, Mankato State University

Missouri: Dan B. Curtis, Central Missouri State University; David Peerholdt, Central Missouri State University

Nebraska: Jack Kay, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; Larry D. Theye, Kearney State College

North Dakota: Hazel Heiman, University of North Dakota; Paul Johnson

Ohio: Linda L. Moore, University of Akron; Anita C. James, Ohio University

Oklahoma: Wayne L. Murrow, Bethany Nazarene College; Craig A. Newburger, East Central State University; Arlie W. Daniel, East Central State University

South Dakota: Wayne L. Hoogestraat, South Dakota State University; Mike A. Turchen, Dakota Wesleyan University

Wisconsin: Thomas F. Kaye, Milwaukee Marshall High School; James P. Siettmann, Marquette University

THE CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL

VOLUME 34 FALL, 1983 NUMBER 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The "Scholar's Anthology": Televisual Studies — *Bruce E. Gronbeck*

Television criticism as an academic field of inquiry has exploded in the '70s and '80s, and this issue offers a sampling of such work.

The Discourses of TV Quiz Shows or, School + Luck = Success + Sex — *John Fiske* 139

This essay argues for a theory of "reading" which equates the ways viewers make sense of televisual texts with the ways they make sense of social experience in general. Examining TV quiz shows, it isolates the four main discourses of quiz shows—capitalist economics, education, sex, and gambling—and relates those discourses to class structures in society.

Dynasty: The Dialectic of Feminine Power — *Cathy Schwichtenberg* 151

This essay explores the myth and ideology behind the representation of feminine power in the nighttime serial, Dynasty. *As a model text of this genre,* Dynasty *uses epic form to foreground the problematic position of women in power within a kinship system that exploits women's procreativity for material ends.*

Ideology and Television News: A Metaphoric Analysis of Political Stories — *Dennis K. Mumby* and *Carole Spitzack* 162

This paper sets up a framework for language analysis which may prove useful in articulating the perspectival view of the world that television news offers. Six political stories from ABC's World News Tonight *are used as a case study to explicate the political realtity that is created when reporters adopt certain metaphoric structures.*

Robert Schuller: The American Dream in a Crystal Cathedral — *Martha Solomon* 172

This essay explores the rhetorical process underlying the outstanding success of Robert Schuller's gospel of possibility thinking. Schuller's amalgamation of secular and spiritual values produces a rhetorically powerful version of American Civil Religion which sanctifies self-interest and relieves the tension in his audience's minds between competitive private enterprise and Christian brotherhood. However,

this blending of two sets of values is potentially harmful to believers and to American society because it blurs the distinction between religious and secular values and removes the healthy tension between religious and other social institutions.

John Lennon and the Advisory Function of Eulogies — *Karen A. Foss* 187

This essay uses Burke's concept of guilt, resulting from hierarchy and perfection inherent in language, to explore the symbolic dimensions of the shooting of John Lennon and its public coverage. Implications of this study for a genre of assassination rhetoric are suggested.

SPECIAL REPORTS: AMERICAN BROADCASTING

Toward Analyses of Live Television Broadcasts — *Barbra S. Morris* and *Joel Nydahl* 195

Radio Free America: The U.S. Government's Reaction to Pirate Radio — *Douglas A. Boyd* 203

CSSJ Information File on Conferences, Conventions, and Organizations

THE "SCHOLAR'S ANTHOLOGY": TELEVISUAL STUDIES

As little as fifteen years ago, a person wishing to teach a college-level course in the criticism of television could read through the "important" pieces of television criticism in about a week, with time left over for viewing *Laugh-In, Bonanza, The Glen Campbell Goodtime Hour,* and, my favorite, *Mission: Impossible.* When, however, with the help of Caren Deming at San Francisco State, I compiled a bibliography on non-quantitative studies of television and society in 1980, I ended up with forty pages of entries, and did not even list articles from anthologies individually. The field had exploded in those intervening years; television criticism had become an academically respectable pursuit. Why?

Many reasons could be postulated. Marshall McLuhan sat in a Fordham chair worth a cool $100,000, pontificating his preachments to ever-widening audiences. Many students of TV production in the late '60's became interested in video and "guerrilla television," and hence in televisual aesthetics. Governmental hearings on violence and children made Pastore-al headlines, with public pressure groups (especially Action for Children's Television and the National Education Association) demanding reform—less violence, fewer commercials, stronger and more diversified role models, family viewing hours. Horace Newcomb, in *TV: The Most Popular Art* (1974), combined generic, social, and aesthetic criticism in an overview of American television, while Stuart Hall's colleagues at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Studies and Raymond Williams' understudies at Cambridge investigated relationships among mass mediated technology, content, and socio-political currents. And, for good measure, the politically active left and right in America took on Eric Barnouw's "Tube of Plenty," bashing networks with their ideological axes.

Additional moves in- and out of the academy were made through the '70s, of course, and all of them coalesced to add breadth, depth, and technical acuity to the field of televisual studies. Indeed, now that the Speech Communication Association has launched *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* television aficionados will have an even more readily available source of critical studies.

The Scholar's Anthology which follows is essentially a sampler. Television criticism has become wracked by varied "-isms," "-ologies," and "-ians," and it is impossible to represent them all. Here you will find, however, a few of them. John Fiske graciously has given us an example of British (now Australian) cultural studies in his dissection of TV game shows, producing the sort of hegemonic analysis which he helped popularize five years ago. Cathy Schwichtenberg combines semiological and narrative theory to construct a double reading of the nighttime serial *Dynasty;* her views on feminized power and eroticism are provocative. Denny Mumby and Carole Spitzack have interests similar to both Fiske and Schwichtenberg in their ideological exploration of types of news narratives. In contrast, Martha Solomon continues her by-now systematic assault on American *mythoi* in her examination of Robert Schuller's mixture of self-reliance and divine guidance. This issue then finishes with two special reports—Barbra Morris and Joel Nydahl's exemplification of a utilitarian method for analyzing live sports telecasts, and Douglas Boyd's recapitulation of America's only recent pirate radio operation, Radio Free America.

So, turn off *Hill Street Blues,* and do a little reading for a change. . . .

THE DISCOURSES OF TV QUIZ SHOWS OR, SCHOOL + LUCK = SUCCESS + SEX

John Fiske

TV quiz shows in the U.S., U.K. and Australia all wax and wane in the ratings. Examples of the genre occasionally top the ratings, while at other times they slip to a more modest position. But they never fade away; their popularity may vary in degree, but never in fact. In this paper I wish to theorise about the reasons for that popularity, and I say theorise because I have made no empirical audience investigation, nor even an objective content analysis of the programmes. My theory of popularity, which I define as an easy interrelationship between the reader's experience of the text and his or her social experience, is one that is best arrived at by a study of the text itself. The text produces its model reader, while allowing space for the actual reader to produce a model text.

I wish firstly then to trace four main discourses that typically structure these shows (and by discourse I mean a subsystem of signs together with their socially located meanings). These are the discourse of capitalist economics, the discourse of education, the discourse of gambling, and the discourse of sex. Then I shall make a slight digression to consider the theories of Pierre Bourdieu on the relationship of education and culture to class, for his theory allows me to see the classifying function of knowledge in the quizzes as a symbolic equivalent of the way that education and culture classify us into a class-structured society. Finally, I shall propose a theory of reading which concludes that making sense of a text is an activity precisely parallel to making sense of social experience, and that it is the mutually validating fit between textual experience and social experience that accounts for the popularity of specific texts.

A simplistic reading will serve as our point of departure. These shows present symbolically the role of education in a competitive capitalist society, where education is there to be cashed in for the rewards offered to the successful in a materialist, class-structured society. This sort of quiz show (and there are others), then, gives us a regular symbolic enactment of cashing education in for economic success. *The Sale of the Century* becomes, in this reading, a thirty-minute miniaturization of a social process that is crucial in a society that is (a) class structured and (b) socially mobile, and (c) holds the doctrine of equal opportunity. Education, as we will see later, underwrites the class structure, enables social mobility and works through equal opportunity.

Attractive though such a reading may be, it is shot through with too many uninspected assumptions for it to stand up to any serious scrutiny. At the heart of it is the assumption that the acquisition of consumer goods is unquestionably a highly valued activity. This, perhaps surprisingly, is not the case.

John Fiske is Principal Lecturer in the School of English, Western Australian Institute of Technology, Bentley, Western Australia. *An earlier version of this paper was published in the* Australian Journal of Screen Theory, 13 (February 1983), *under the title "TV Quiz Shows and the Purchase of Cultural Capital."* [Editor's note: *Readers wishing to understand more fully the metacritical assumptions and critical system out of which Professor Fiske is working should see John Fiske and John Hartley,* Reading Television, *New Accents Series (London: Methuen, 1978). Please note that, given common British scholarly practice, specific page numbers to quotations have not been supplied.*]

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 34 (Fall 1983), 139-150

The growth of our materialist society has been accompanied by a stream of moralistic and idealistic warnings about the limits of the satisfaction that material success can offer. Greed and acquisitiveness are frequently marks of the villain in our popular fiction. Even a British conservative Prime Minister, Ted Heath, coined the phrase, "the unacceptable face of capitalism." And yet quiz shows appear to present this "unacceptable face" in an unequivocally positive way. Eager audiences urge the contestants to take greater risks for greater prizes, in some shows the prizes themselves are greeted with rapturous applause, and the monetary value of everything is strongly foregrounded. In *The New Price is Right*, the monetary value of the prize is the substance of the competition—"knowing the value" is the skill that wins the object being valued. The camera zooms in on the eager expressions of the contestants as they near the goal, and lingers in loving closeup on the delight of the winners. The comperes make comments like "the whole object of the game is not just to win at the end but to grab as much as you can along the way," "And we're going for a nice free spend up for you."[1]

John Davies has demonstrated how the car, the star prize of *Sale of the Century*, is treated as an actual star in the introductory segment of the show. It revolves on a podium, surrounded by flashing lights, and the camera zooms in, not steadily but in a series of jump cuts, until it finishes in a closeup of the radiator grille. Each of the eleven jump cuts in this zoom is one-third of a second, or eight frames. The 3.6 seconds of the sequence are accompanied by a drum roll and frenzied applause, and the effect is, as Davies argues, that

> The audience is literally jerked towards that car, as if an unseen hand took us and dragged us, stumbling in each 8-frame shot, to arrive breathless at the glittering bonnet. I have observed the eyes of uninterested newspaper readers drawn to the screen. The forks of eaters pause in mid-mouthful and the fingers of avid M*A*S*H fans (programmed at the same time) hover immobile over the channel switch until we reach that car—it *works every time*.[2]

He goes on to argue that part of the reason for this is physical, that the editing rate of three shots per second falls within the perception band of stroboscopic effects. But my point is, stroboscopic effect or no, the car is given star status, the audience positioned as fans and given the right to possess by proxy the admired construct of their own fantasies.

Material acquisition may not be an unquestioned virtue in society, but it *is* in the programmes, and the way that they manage to defuse negative evaluations of their central discourse is by its structural relationship with the other discourses of the text.

One such relationship is that of the *sexual discourse to the economic*. The glamorous female assistant is a common motif: The prizes are rarely displayed without a model draping herself around, in, over, or through the material rewards. We can trace a number of reasons for this. One is our culture's habit of linking economic success with sexual success. This is partly, as Berger[3] has made clear, an extension of the concept of possession. Possessing material goods leads inevitably, naturally, to possessing women. Part of this is the concept of manliness and virility. In a capitalist, competitive society, a man's way of proving himself better than the next is by his success in the accumulation of economic capital, and so it follows that, with men as with bull elephants, young stallions, and buffaloes, the most successful male is rewarded with a harem. In the traditional tribe of the businessman, the harem may be reduced to a secretary/mistress for the office or business trip and a wife at home, but the concept remains valid.

So we should not be surprised that the symbolic productions of our popular culture easily interweave the discourses of sex and of

[1] *The Sale of the Century* (TV show).

[2] J. Davies, "Sale of the Century—Sign of the Decade," *Australian Journal of Screen Theory*, 13 (February 1983).

[3] J. Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1972).

economic success when we find the equivalent value systems interwoven elsewhere in the culture. I have deliberately used the word 'natural' to describe this linkage, because this is, I think, the crucial function that the sexual discourse performs on behalf of the economist—it makes the economic appear natural. However committed a capitalist we may be, we must be aware that capitalism is specific to our culture, that it is, therefore, arbitrary. It follows from this that capitalist success has, potentially at least, a hole in the middle of it. Sex, however, is, above all else, natural. We like to think of sexual attractiveness as a natural attribute, part of our bodies' physics and chemistry, which enables us to relate it to Darwinian ideas of natural selection and survival of the fittest which, when transferred to the sphere of economics, play a crucial role in legitimising the basis of a free-enterprise market economy. In the physical or sexual sphere, these ideas enable us to relate notions of sexual attractiveness not only to the survival of the species but to its progressive, evolutionary improvement. The neatness of fit between sexual success and economic success should not surprise us, for both are manifestations of the same value system operating in parallel social systems. Sexual success in the sphere of personal relations and economic success in the sphere of social relations have the parallel guarantors of evolutionary theory and free-enterprise economic theory. And the parallelism of the structure of values within the personal and the socio-economic systems sets up a mutually validating relationship.

This may seem a large responsibility to hand on the shoulders of a half-clad model wrapping herself around a motor scooter that is the reward for knowing Buffalo Bill's real name. But I make no apologies for doing so. There is consistent evidence that our culture links economic success with sexual success; and the effect of this is to transfer the naturalness of the sexual system to the economic and thus legitimate it. Sex defuses the arbitrariness of capitalism. We are, then, starting to answer the question why the moral ambiguity of capitalism is not transferred to our normal response to quiz programmes.

The common practice of ideological closure is at work; the naked discourse of capitalism would attract alternative readings by virtue of its moral ambivalence and therefore of its perceived arbitrariness: but some of those potential alternatives are closed off by the much less ambivalent discourse of sexuality. The ideological force within the reader to "make sense" of the text drives him or her to find associative links between the two discourses of the sort that I have suggested. But the alternative readings are not closed off entirely, and never can be. For instance, in some shows the sexuality of the model is minimised, and the sexual discourse is moved into the family. The symbolic (sometimes actual) husband and wife team that host most shows, the frequent references to the family life of the contestants, and, in some shows, the apppearance of the family on the screen, either as contestants or in the audience, all demonstrate how strongly the ideology of the family underlies the meaning of the shows in the same way that it underlies the meaning of the social experience of much of the audience. This proposes a quite different relationship between the sexual and economic discourses in which economic success now acquires the validation of 'providing for the family' but this is a point to which I shall return later. My purpose for the moment is to establish that, whether inside or outside the family context, the sexual and economic discourses can be related by the audience in such a way as to make sense.

And the ways in which this sense-making relationship can be constructed in the text are parallel to and determined by the ways in which precisely the same relationship can be constructed in making sense of our social experience. The text itself does not insist that the link between sex and economic success should be made within or outside the family system: It merely invites us to make that link, provides us with at least two ways of making it, and then leaves us to find in the text the same relationship that we use to structure

our social relation. We do the ideological work of the text for it and thus powerfully guarantee its rightness.

If the economic capitalist discourse is one main pillar of the genre, the other is *the educational discourse*. The shows are symbolic re-enactments of the examination system, only here the rewards of success are immediate, not deferred. And education bears the same sort of structural relationship to economics as does sex: it validates the accumulation of economic capital. We have noted how materialist values are, paradoxically, in a capitalist society never viewed unequivocally. But there is no such uncertainty about how to value education: it is unequivocally a "good thing." So if educational success results in economic success, the esteem of education transfers easily and invisibly to economics.

But what is particularly interesting here is the way that this relationship is effected by means of a short cut. In society, a good education, that is knowing the answers to teachers' questions, will, we are told, lead to a good job which will lead to material rewards. But in the symbolic world of quiz shows the middle term is missing, the timescale is collapsed, and education leads inevitably, immediately, to the middle class commercial life style. There are a number of consequences of this vanished middle term. The first is that schoolkids watching the show (and we know that it rates highly with them) are able to use this relationship of the discourses of education and economics to make sense of their social experience at school. Here, the lesson that learning is vital if one wishes to harvest the fruits of a materialist, capitalist society, is a constant and essential feature of the informal curriculum. For the student, the learning is present and part of everyday experience, but the payoff is far in the future, and must be taken on trust. The quiz shows enable him or her to see that the relationship between education and economics is, possibly, at least, a valid one. The quiz show is popular because its fit with social experience is close enough for the student to validate one with the other. The parallel means of making sense are mutually supportive.

But the shows are also popular with adults, who are in the workforce and who, presumably, do not need the collapse of the middle term to make sense of the relationship between educational and economic success. For them the invisibility of work in the cause and effect sequence can make sense, can relate to their social experience, in another, equally useful or popular, way.

It is noticeable how invisible productive work is in our popular culture. This may be because we use our entertainment to escape from the world of work, but I suspect that the ideological effect is different. By not showing productive work, TV implies that wealth is a function of personality or social position—not of the exploitation of others. Dorfman and Mattelart[4] have shown how, in Walt Disney comics, Donald Duck and his nephews typically find wealth as buried treasure or gold nuggets, or else win it in competitions or even get given it as a reward for foiling robbers. Wealth is thus naturalized: It is taken out of the class and economic system, and the unequal distribution of that wealth is located not in society, but in personality or luck. So the adult viewer, who by definition will statistically be one of the subordinate, the less successful educationally and economically, is turned away from locating the cause of subordination in society and given the opportunity of making sense of the text and of social experience according to the dominant ideology. This, of course, proposes that wealth is everyone's right, and given a little bit of luck (and education!) it can fall plumb into anybody's lap. And the wealth, or inability to attain economic success, therefore, becomes a function of the individual, not of the system.

This leads us neatly into the *discourse of gambling* which is comparatively easy to explain. It is there not only to provide an element of uncertainty and suspense, but more important, to provide a face-saving

[4]A. Dorfman and A. Mattelart, *How to Read Donald Duck* (New York: International General, 1975).

outlet for the losers and an egalitarian rationalisation for the winners. 'Luck' is crucial in the mythology of a class-structured, free-enterprise, equal-opportunity society, because it provides the inevitable majority at the bottom of the heap with a more acceptable reason for their subordination than that they were simply "not good enough." In a professedly egalitarian variant of capitalism, such as Australia's, luck also prevents the winners from being too far separated from the losers. "I was luckier than you, mate" is easier and more egalitarian than "I was better than you, mate." When a new arrival from Britain, I was struck by the emphasis given to gambling in Australian shows in comparison to their British equivalents; the British *Sale of the Century* has no lucky "pick a personality" section, whereas in Australia's the one who picks the right personality can 'earn' enough money to beat the one who answers the most questions. The egalitarianism of luck seems to me to be a particularly Australian characteristic.

In the shows, one function of gambling, then, is to close the gap between the winners and losers, and this is a precise parallel to one of its functions in society. In Western Australia at the moment there is a controversy over the selling of instant lottery tickets from newsstands. Their opponents claim that those most tempted to buy the tickets are those least likely to be able to afford them—the young, the unemployed, the single parent, the old. This ignores the fact that these are precisely those who most need to close the gap between winners and losers.

The text of the quiz show is open to audience members to see the relationship of the discourse of gambling to that of economics as the same as it is in their social experience. Making sense of the relationship in the quiz programme is the same activity as making sense of social experience and the pleasure given by the programme is a direct result of this mutually validating relationship between text and society.

We might wish to take this argument even further, and argue that the displacement of economic and social inequality into luck serves the interest of the dominant class. The subordinate are led to understand and evaluate their subordination according to a frame of reference that is finally against their own interests. These interests would, the argument runs, be best served by seeing that the necessity of their subordination is fundamental to the capitalist system. By displacing it into luck, and by thus accepting that they have a chance of that luck, they are led to consent to and perpetuate a system that inevitably, necessarily, disadvantages them. The sense that they make of the programme and of society is a sense that serves the interests of the dominant, not of the surbordinate. The question is not *what* sense do we make, but *whose* sense? Meaning is a political and social force, and, as Voloshinov[5] makes clear, is therefore necessarily a site of ideological struggle.

So, we are now able to reach an interim conclusion about the popularity of quiz programmes. It goes like this: Quiz programmes are a peculiarly typical entertainment genre in our capitalist, class-structured society. They demonstrate symbolically that the rewards such a society offers really *are* available for all, that the free-enterprise, equal-opportunity system *works*. All you need is a bit more talent and luck than the next bloke and the bedroom suite falls into your lap. But, like all good ideological practices, they work not on a single plane of signification, for they work to contain and defuse contradictions. And they achieve this work not rationally, but by association and narrative, that is, they work mythically. Each contest is a narrative myth, like the Cinderella one, that demonstrates that our system works—opportunities are equal, and talent (with luck) will be rewarded.

The contradiction that needs defusing is simple, though crucial. With a traditional class system based on birth, those trapped at the bottom knew it was their proper, or even

[5]V. Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. L. and I. R. Titunik (New York: Seminar Press, 1973). Orig. pub. in Russian, 1929.

natural, place—

The rich man in his castle
the poor man at his gate
God made them high and lowly
And ordered their estate

—as the 19th-century hymn has it. But in a class-structured meritocracy, those trapped at the bottom (by definition, the majority) "know" that it is their *fault* they are there. They did not have the talent to grasp the opportunities offered them. The discourse of gambling which excuses this unwelcome conclusion cannot, finally, defuse it.

The model reader of these shows is one who perceives himself or herself as economically and educationally subordinate, and who accepts, if not the subordination, at least the system that produced it. This acceptance is tribute to the powerful work of these programmes whose hegemonic effect is to defuse the negative and potentially revolutionary responses to their readers' social experience. The shows reproduce the central features of the social system and demonstrate it to be fair and just; they show it working to the benefit of all.

Some empirical support for this idea is provided by a well known uses and gratifications study by McQuail, Blumler, and Brown back in 1972[6] when they found correlations between some of the gratifications depicted in quiz programmes and the social class of the viewer. For instance, working class viewers were more likely to use quiz programmes as a basis for self-rating, and reported responses like "I can compare myself with the experts" or "I imagine that I was on the programme and doing well." Similarly, those with the lowest educational achievements used the programmes for their educational appeal and responded with statements like "I find I know more than I thought" or "I feel I have improved myself." This investigation also revealed the breadth of the appeal of the quiz programmes, in that they also have a widely appreciated excitement or escapism appeal, and provide a good basis for social interaction and participation.

Both this 'uses and gratifications' reading, and the more semiotic one outlined earlier, grant the shows a form of compensatory function. The difference between the two lies in the effects each imputes to this compensation; uses and gratifications defines the effects as individualistic, for the shows reduce personal or socially induced frustrations in the viewer and thereby increase his sense of personal satisfaction. The semiotic reading, however, imputes a social rather than an individual effect, as the viewer is led to accept and approve the social order, not just his or her individual experience of it.

This reading of quizzes as capitalism in miniature is attractive, but not finally satisfactory, for it accords to the educational discourse a less significant role than the structure of the programmes themselves would warrant. Bourdieu's theories of cultural stratification are the ones that seem to me to have the greatest explanatory power here, for in them he relates class to culture and education in a way that provides a model for the relationship of economic capital with knowledge and education that we find in the quiz shows.

The crucial difference between Bourdieu and the ideas that I want to develop after him is that he concentrates on aesthetic taste and sensitivity (which he sees as the hallmarks of culture) and shows how these are related to the class system and propagated by the educational system. My argument depends upon replacing culture with knowledge. I propose that knowledge is, for the subordinate, the equivalent of culture for the dominant classes: The ruling classes have appropriated culture for themselves and thus have rendered it unavailable for the subordinate classes who provide the contestants and, we surmise, the audience for our quizzes. For as Bourdieu[7] makes clear, education is, in the

[6]D. McQuail, J. G. Blumler, and J. R. Brown, "The Television Audience: A Revised Perspective," in *Sociology of Mass Communications*, ed. D. McQuail (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).

[7]P. Bourdieu, "The Aristocracy of Culture," *Media, Culture and Society*, 2 (1980), 225–254.

eyes of the dominant, ultimately concerned with establishing standards of taste and of value; to the subordinate, however, education is there to provide knowledge that has a usable end-point.

One further point should be noted here. This is that the knowledge required to answer quiz questions is rarely that which is learnt at school; rather, it is an odd mixture of current affairs, sports and showbiz, simple geography and history, and popular literature or music. So the knowledge required to succeed is a symbol of educational success rather than the real thing, in the same way that the material prizes are only symbols of economic success. The educational discourse of the shows is a symbolic and structural equivalent of education in society, not a direct reproduction. And it is interesting to note that when the two come into contact the quiz master has to differentiate them. On *Ford Superquiz*, Bert Newton met a student of statistics who replied, when asked what it involved, "you gain data and try to get information from that data and you make conclusions from that data." "Well" said Bert in reply, "you see I understand that, of course" and he smiled with ironic innocence to the delight of the studio audience, "but the people at home won't follow that" (the laughs redoubled), "but I think it's a wonderful calling and I wish I'd taken it right at this very moment."[8] The humour served to distance Bert and the audience from the disourse of real life education while bringing them closer to its symbolic entertaining equivalent. But even though the knowledge required by quiz shows is only the symbolic equivalent of education, it performs a similar function in that they are both means of classifying people, of sorting out winners from losers, they are both ways of equating apparently innate personal ablility with success and/or esteem, and they both legitimate class differences.

For Bourdieu, culture has a social role that is easily defined: It is to classify and thus guarantee the naturalness of a stratified society. By culture Bourdieu means literature, art, music, language, science, and other symbolic systems, together with a particular response to them. This response is located in the dominant classes and crucial to it is "discrimination"—an aesthetic, intellectual, detached perspective. Thus culture classifies by distinguishing between those who are discriminating and those who are not. The discriminating inherit a cultural capital which is a product of a specific education and system of taste. Access to this cultural capital is via what Bourdieu calls "symbolic competence," that is the ability to manipulate and respond discriminatingly to language, art, music, and all the symbolic systems that constitute culture. This symbolic competence is distributed differentially amongst different social classes. But Bourdieu's main point is clear: Cultural capital is legitimating and possibly replacing economic capital as a means of differentiating classes. And had he worked in Australia rather than France, Bourdieu would, I am sure, have found even more evidence to support his theory. For when the subordinate are affluent, as in Australia, money loses much of its capacity to mark class differences, and culture increasingly takes on that role.

And the main institution through which culture is propagated is, of course, the school and the university. Bourdieu sees education as essentially a divisive classifying process and a particularly effective one because it performs this role while being widely accepted as an unbiased and neutral system. This ensures its acceptability to the subordinate because it offers to them the apparent opportunity of upward social mobility (though we must note the frequency with which they opt out of both education and class aspirations). It also ensures its acceptability to the dominant because it guarantees that their position of dominance is based upon talent and ability.

So the educational system both promotes culture as a stratifying force and controls access to the cultural capital, which, when

[8] *Ford Superquiz* (TV show).

unequally distributed throughout society, constitutes the means of that stratification. This access is apparently open to all, but as Bourdieu argues, "*education* can be of full benefit only to those who owe to their family circle the competence acquired by slow and imperceptible familiarization. . . . While it is true that only the school can give the continuous and prolonged, methodical and uniform training capable of *mass production* . . . of competent individuals, provided with schemes of perception, thought and expression which are prerequisites for the appropriation of cultural wealth, and endowed with the generalized and permanent inclination to appropriate this wealth which is the mark of devotion to culture, the fact remains that the effectiveness of this moulding action is directly dependent upon the degree to which those undergoing it fulfil the preliminary conditions for adequate reception."[9] In other words, school reproduces class via culture.

But it does more than this, it legitimates the social order by the manipulation of self-image and self-esteem: "The official differences produced by academic classifications tend to produce real differences by inducing in the classified individuals a collectively recognised and supported belief in those differences" and a belief in the system that produced them. This produces in turn "behaviours that are intended to bring the real being into line with the official being."[10] The official differences of school become real differences in society insofar as the differentiated individuals accept both the differentiation and the system.

And one thing quiz games provide is a face-saver. They can symbolically restore the self-image and self-esteem of the subordinate via an equivalent of the system that destroyed them in the first place. They play an important role in the educational hegemony in that their compensation for, or even denial of, the disadvantages of educational failure is achieved by reproducing and thus validating the system that produced that failure in the first place.

The educational discourse is like the economic in the high esteem which it accords to the doctrine of equal opportunity while ensuring that the few are more equal than the majority. As Kennett puts it: " 'All are equal before the examination' it appears, but in fact the existing structure in its interrelations with the dominant culture has already picked the winners. 'All are equal before the examination' is a 'produced' fact regarded as a fact by dominant and subordinate alike, and its consequence is that order is maintained in the school and on the streets."[11]

The role of education and culture in naturalising social differences is the crucial one (and we must remember here my argument that knowledge in quiz shows is the symbolic equivalent of culture in society): "The unnatural idea of inborn culture, of a gift of culture bestowed on certain people by nature, is inseparable from blindness to the functions of the institution which ensures the profitability of the cultural heritage and legitimises its transmission while concealing that it fulfils this function. The school, in fact, is the institution which, through its outwardly irreproachable verdicts, transforms socially conditioned inequalities in regard to culture into inequalities of success, interpreted as inequalities of gifts which are also inequalities of merit."[12]

So let me sum up my selection of Bourdieu's ideas. Differences of culture, education, and knowledge are social differences. Culture and knowledge are definers of social class. But more important, they enable us to define social differences as natural because they are derived from apparently demonstrable individual differences such as intelligence or taste. Our social differences, manifest as

[9]P. Bourdieu, "Outline of a Sociological Theory of Art Perception," *International Social Sciences Journal*, 20, No. 4 (1968), 589–612.
[10]Bourdieu, "The Aristocracy. . ."
[11]J. Kennett, "The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu," *Educational Review*, 25, No. 3 (1973), 237–254.
[12]Bourdieu, "Outline. . ."

different levels of cultural competence, now can be explained acceptably as resulting from differing individual and therefore natural capacities or tastes which education first develops and then measures. This educational development and measurement are available to all, but are not, in fact, fair to all, because some classes provide the preconditions for this development to occur, while others do not. Culture, therefore, not only perpetuates the social order, but also justifies it, for it is based upon the apparent equality of opportunity within the education system which 'guarantees' the objectivity of the classifications it produces and therefore of the social stratification derived from them. Raymond Williams makes a similar point when he argues that "equality of opportunity is essentially the desire to perpetuate a non-egalitarian society."[13] When class differences can be naturalised by individual differences, hegemony is at its strongest.

This hegemony is seen in the way that subordinate classes willingly count themselves out of certain kinds of knowledge and out of certain cultural products—"opera is not for me," "abstract art is a load of rubbish." Thus, the subordinate classes discount knowledge for its own sake, and count knowledge that is only "valorised to the strict extent of its technical efficiency."[14] Quiz shows, by converting knowledge to material goods, give this knowledge a double pay-off: On the one hand they accord it the efficiency of counted knowledge for the subordinate class, and on the other accord it the esteem of the pure knowledge of the dominant culture. So these shows provide not only the material rewards of economic success, but also the esteem that is the reward of educational success.

It is interesting to note, too, that there appears to be an inverse relationship between the degree of emphasis given to the economic and educational discourses, and the nature of the prizes offered. In something like *The New Price is Right*, the economic discourse is foregrounded while the educational discourse is demoted (for it presents the everyday knowledge of prices/bargains/values in a competitive form that enables it to act as a classifier, thus enabling it to perform the same function as more 'educational' knowledge). The whole show revolves around prices and values. *Family Feud* represents the extreme at this end of the scale in that it deliberately turns its back on school knowledge—by definition *theirs*—and promotes *our* knowledge: The skill lies in being as like the rest of us as possible. The more the answers approach the norm, the more likely the contestant is to win. In *Sale of the Century* and *Ford Superquiz* the two discourses are held much more in balance, and, at the other end of the scale, *Top of the World* and *Mastermind* emphasize the educational almost exclusively. Their choice of prizes is significant in that the prizes play a minimized role in these last two shows, and are objects in which the cultural value is as high as the economic—a vintage Rolls Royce and a classical Greek statuette.

Mills and Rice propose that shows of the type of *Family Feud* (i.e. ones where the skill lies in being as like the norm as possible) constitute a new and potentially radical form of quiz show. In any society knowledge (or education) equates with social power, and it follows, then, that by taking the ability to define the right answer (i.e. access to knowledge) away from the dominant (the questionmaster and behind him the dictionary or encyclopaedia) and by giving it to the norm or the ordinary, these shows are symbolically indicating a shift of frame towards the subordinate. This shift is no more than that; it does not disrupt the dominant frame of the programme but sets up a contradictory force within it which is a potential site of ideological struggle. They argue that "cultural forms comprise a contradictory and uneven balance of elements, both dominant and subordinate—those which connect with

[13]R. Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780–1950* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1958).
[14]Williams.

the 'popular' social life, and those dominant elements which attempt to close or constrain alternative meanings and which attempt to mute the voice of dissent."[15]

TV quizzes, finally, then, reproduce the balance of social power. In traditional societies, birth entitled a person to economic capital and power. But our meritocracy must be able to demonstrate both that the people at the top are the best, and that the system that puts and keeps them there is also the best.

The educational system guarantees this by proving that cultural capacity equals personal worth. Unequal cultural capacity, unequal cultural consumption, and unequal cultural capital all justify social inequality—the people who have earned cultural capital are, simply, more clever, more discriminating and of higher worth. Quiz shows are a symbolic enactment of this system that demonstrate it working and that give the subordinate classes a superficial taste of the rewards of the system and thus buy their loyalty to an economic and educational system that permanently disadvantages them.

This is the strongly preferred reading, one that derives from the relationship of the two central discourses of education and economics, and one that is, I submit, not easily accessible to a modified or negotiated reading, though Mills and Rice's identification of contradictions within one type of quiz show indicate where such a reading might centre itself.

But to understand the full appeal of the programmes we need to look at the structural relationship of all four discourses of which they are composed—economics, education, sex and gambling. Despite their vibrant tone, they are, I believe, complex texts that repay detailed study and a close analysis of one or two randomly selected programmes would reveal in detail how these discourses might interact.

I shall make no attempt to describe the full potential of the range of relationships between these discourses, merely to suggest its variety. This variety is important because it leaves the viewer or reader of the programmes a lot of work to do, and this work is at the heart of the ideological practice.

It exploits our drive to make sense, to make connections either narratively or associatively between constituent elements. The programmes propose a set of links between the two main discourses of economics and education that make sense, but they leave much more open the relationships amongst these and the minor ones of sex and gambling. The reader is given the illusion of freedom to construct his or her own reading, to make sense of a relatively open text. I say illusion of freedom, because the freedom is clearly circumscribed by the two main discourses, but none the less there is a measure of freedom to negotiate readings specific to the reader. The excitement of the gamble may be more significant for some; others may relate gambling to the examination system at school ("I failed/passed because the right questions did/did not come up"). Gambling also may be related to the economic discourse and may thus reproduce the risk-taking inherent in capitalist economics. Here the risk of losing all justifies the profits made: So in quiz shows, the risk of losing previous winnings provides not only excitement but also a symbolic representation and validation of free enterprise capitalism. Similarly some may read the sexual discourse in a marital context (the pseudo family of host and hostess is significant) and thus will relate it differently to the economic discourse than when it is read in an extra-marital context. In the marital context the reading derived from sexual-economic relationships may find the meaning of winning prizes in "providing for my family" while in an extra-marital context the same relationship may, as we have seen, naturalize material success, equate sexual with material possession, and endow the entrepreneur with the values of virility.

Because most of these sense-making relationships are left open, the readers have to

[15]A. Mills and P. Rice, "Quizzing the Popular," *Screen Education*, 41 (Winter/Spring 1982).

engage actively with the text; they have to make their own sense by constructing a set of meaningful relationships for the discourses of the text that corresponds to the way they structure their understanding of their social experience. This proposes that texts bear a close but simplified and displaced relationship to social experience. The model that underlies my proposition is similar to Morley's[16] view of reading as the moment when the discourse of the text meets the multiplicity of discourses in the reader. He argues that Parkin's[17] theory of meaning-systems and Hall's[18] theory of preferred readings which evolved from it are basically on the right lines, but that both seriously oversimplify the number of meaning systems involved. For Morely, then, "the meaning of the text must be thought of in terms of which set of discourses it encounters in any particular set of circumstances, and how this encounter may restructure both the meaning of the text and the discourses which it meets. The meaning of the text will be constructed differently according to the discourses brought to bear on the text by the reader and the crucial factor in the encounter of audience/subject and the text will be the range of discourses at the disposal of the audience."[19]

We need a variety of discourses in order to live and make sense of our social lives: Our social experience is a "lived text" that is far more complex than any produced text. A produced text, such as the quiz shows, selects key discourses used in the making sense of social experience or 'lived texts' and combines their symbolic equivalents into a simpler structure with a more or less well established hierarchy of preferences. But the preferences of relationships, the establishing of dominant codes, only go so far: The produced texts require the readers to negotiate their readings within the dominant framework of preference. This parallels their activity of making sense of their lived texts or social experience. Here, too, they are required to negotiate readings within that framework of preference that is largely a function of the space they occupy within the structure of society and its value systems.

What I am proposing here, then, is that social experience is read in much the same way as a text. Certain of the central discourses by which we live and understand our life have 'closed' or preferred relationships: This closure is effected by our social location within the matrix of class, family, education, occupation, gender, race, and so on. But other, less central discourses, have more 'open,' more negotiable relationships.[20] It is our ability to structure these relationships, to make our own sense of our own experience that provides our illusion of personal ideational freedom—"I make up my own mind about things, thank you very much!" And reading the text requires a parallel activity to this making our own sense of our own experience. When reading the open areas of the text, that is those areas with open, not preferred, relationships between the discourses, we construct our own sense-making structure that parallels the one we construct to make sense of our social experience. And this activity common to reading both lived and produced texts is what diverts our attention from the ideological closure effected by the preferred relationship of the crucial, central discourses. So the text produces its own model reader via its preferred relationships, but allows enough space within its open relationships for the actual reader to produce his or her own model text, and thus to produce for himself or herself a sense of ideational freedom.

This illusion of ideational freedom, then, provides the smokescreen of common sense under which ideological practice can go

[16]D. Morley, *The 'Nationwide' Audience* (London: British Film Institute, 1980).
[17]F. Parkin, *Class Inequality and Political Order* London: Paladin, 1972).
[18]S. Hall, "Encoding/Decoding," in *Culture, Media, Language*, ed. S. Hall et al. (London: Hutchinson, 1980).
[19]Morley.
[20]U. Eco, *The Role of the Reader: Explorations of the Semiotics of Texts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979).

about its unnoticed work. And ideology is only effective when the individuals constituted by it feel that they have arrived at their position as a result of free will, not of ideological determination. But invisibility is not the only prerequisite of ideology: The other is its perceived effectiveness. For ideological practice works and maintains itself only in so far as it can be seen to make sense of social experience, to make not just sense, but common sense, so that the sense appears natural, not arbitrary and culture-specific. And this is one function of popular culture: It provides disguised symbolic demonstrations of the explanatory effectiveness and naturalness of the dominant ideology. The more 'open' the popular text, the more, that is, that the reading of it reproduces the reader's work in making sense of his social experience, so the more satisfaction, or even complacency, the reader will derive from it, and the more effectively the hegemony will have been maintained. The activity of the reader in negotiating his or her own meaning within the ideologically preferred one is what diverts his or her attention from this ideological preference and thus guarantees its effectiveness. A closed text, one that allows no room for individually negotiated readings, is propaganda and is normally recognised as such. This recognition, of course, then invites a radically opposed reading that rejects the ideological work of the text.

The reader, then, is a multiplicity of discourses through which he or she lives and understands his or her social life. The text is a structured and limited set of discourses and reading is the process by which the lived discourses of the reader are equated with the discourses of the text. This equation produces a meaning that validates both. A degree of openness in the text is therefore necessary to cope with the variety of social experience of the readers, but this openness must be hung round a clear core of preferred reading or it would produce textual, social, and ideological anarchy. The preferred meaning establishes the ideological limits within which to negotiate the subsidiary readings. And my contention is that the popularity of quiz shows can be explained by these two dimensions—the power of the preferred reading to validate and naturalize the dominant ideology, and the openness of the negotiated readings to allow the various social discourses of the readers to be brought to bear upon the discourses of the text in a mutually validating relationship.

DYNASTY: THE DIALECTIC OF FEMININE POWER

Cathy Schwichtenberg

Dynasty: The Drama of Power

The drama in ABC's *Dynasty* is the drama of power—specifically, feminine power. Described as "a serial about power, passion, money and ambition,"[1] the show's narrative is about power and its various manifestations through character interrelationships, many of which place women in dominant, active positions. Although *Dynasty* shares the generic conventions of multiple and simultaneous plot lines and character interrelationships common to both the daytime and nighttime serials, *Dynasty* can be distinguished from its generic counterparts through a representation of power that is epic in form. Indeed, the show's epic proportions and mythic dimensions extend to include powerful female characters who inform a nexus of power relations around the pivotal character, Denver oil magnate Blake Carrington (John Forsythe). While Blake "centers" the narrative, the women who move the narrative include his spunky wife Krystle (Linda Evans) and her "gold-digger" cousin Sammy Jo (Heather Locklear), Blake's Machiavellian ex-wife Alexias (Joan Collins), and his promiscuous daughter Fallon (Pamela Sue Martin).

Dynasty's epic form provides the vehicle for the depiction of women characters who are "larger-than-life." Since *Dynasty* relies on epic form, the show is able to accommodate the stylistic excesses of an opulent and luxurious mise-en-scene which, in turn, provides the backdrop for the representation of female characters with excessive and demanding passions and ambitions. Thus, the female characterizations are stylized and histrionic—de-naturalized to fit within *Dynasty*'s epic framework which presents twentieth-century America's version of Jacobean drama—also epic in scale. For instance, Adam Carrington's devious plot to slowly drive Jeff Colby insane by painting his office walls with a paint that exudes poisonous fumes can find parallels in the revenge plot devices found in *The Dutchess of Malfi* (a poisoned Bible) or *The Revenger's Tragedy* (the lips of a skull painted with poison). Furthermore, the "court intrigue" in *Dynasty* —as in many Jacobean revenge tragedies—is motivated by women characters whose desire for sex and power cannot be constrained. One need only compare Alexias' Machiavellian manipulations in the bedroom and the boardroom or Fallon's sexual insatiability and adulterous encounters with Beatrice-Joanna's excessive desires which are acted upon in *The Changeling* or Evadne's sadomasochistic sex games with the king in *The Maid's Tragedy*.

Clearly, *Dynasty*'s epic form presents women characters whose excessive desires and drives match their royal/ruling class status. Thus the excesses of power and sex that typify *Dynasty*'s female characters are integral to (not outside of) the show's decadent royal family paradigm. If this is the case, then one must be cautious when analyzing the women's function within the narrative, for what may initially appear to be *invention* at the level of character or role analysis may really be *convention* in term's of the women's function and position within the overall narrative system of the nighttime

Cathy Schwichtenberg is a doctoral candidate in the Film Division of the Department of Communication and Theatre Arts at the University of Iowa.

[1] *TV Guide*, January 10-16, 1981, p. A-50.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 34 (Fall 1983), 151-161

serial genre. In short, even though the *Dynasty* women have adopted stereotypical male behaviors in relation to sex and power, this alone cannot be labeled politically progressive under the auspices of a feminist reading because such a de-contextualization of the characters disregards the intratextual narrative system of power relations which define and determine the women's place within a narrative context. Mere character or role analysis runs the risk of producing truncated readings that do not and cannot account for the complex lines of interaction which provide a more comprehensive view of the workings of the text itself as a methodological field.

Thus, while it can be argued that *Dynasty*'s female characters are powerful, sexy, and "larger-than-life" because they have appropriated typically male positions and desires, it is crucial to provide a theoretical framework and a narrative context that defines them as such. In order to understand what constitutes "feminine power," how it is represented, and why it is so appealing, it is necessary to perform an ideological critique of the textual mechanisms that foreground the representation and enactment of "feminine power." Indeed, *Dynasty*'s epic presentation of powerful women foregrounds an ideology of feminine power that has mythic underpinnings. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to examine the ideology and myth of feminine power by analyzing: (1) power in *Dynasty* as represented through epic form, (2) a visual description of the power positions of women within a specific episode of *Dynasty*, and (3) the ideological and mythic significance of a conception of feminine power.

An ideological critique of the notion of feminine power in *Dynasty* should provide a model for the analysis of women's place and function within the nighttime serial genre. The American television "dynasties," which present viewers with decadent tales of oil wealth (as in *Dynasty* or *Dallas*) or wine monopolies (as in *Falcon Crest*), underscore women's narrative position as placed within dialectical contradiction as both commodity forms and as narrative agents. In nighttime serials, women are represented as objects within a world of objects (oil, perfume, wine), grounded within narratives which present systems of commodity production; however, these strong women characters are also distant relatives of the power-hungry and sensual mistresses of Jacobean drama where death (usually of men) is the result of unchecked female power and sexuality.

In short, *Dynasty* is a model text for the examination of women as powerful, active narrative agents in the nighttime serial which provides us with paradigms that foreground the commodity structure of capitalism through epic form. The myth and ideology under advanced capitalism are clearly expressed in a show like *Dynasty* which invites contradictory readings of women's power positions and can enable us to understand how feminine power is mediated and represented through television—the most central narrative transmitter of ideology within contemporary culture.

Narrative Power: Epic Form and the Princely House

The phrases in ads for *Dynasty* which boast "the most powerful saga on television"[2] and "the compelling new drama of America today"[3] not only define the show as a serial, but as a specifically epic serial. *Dynasty* is a "saga," a "story of a proud and passionate family,"[4] and Blake Carrington is described as "the ruler of an empire."[5] Indeed, *Dynasty*'s most pronounced structural feature is found in its epic form.

Specifically, *Dynasty* utilizes epic form according to scale not scope. Scale is the distinguishing feature which illustrates *Dynasty*'s epic form as large scale, a characteristic of Northrop Frye's "high mimetic mode."[6] Frye's description of the high mimetic mode and the epic form emphasize

[2] *TV Guide*, October 31–November 1, 1981, p. A–83.
[3] *TV Guide*, January 31–February 6, 1981, p. A–45.
[4] *TV Guide*, p. A–50.
[5] *TV Guide*, p. A–50.
[6] Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 33–34.

large scale, episodic structure, and the grand simplicity of myth. According to Frye:

> In the high mimetic mode we reach the structure that we think of as typically epic, the form represented by Homer, Virgil, and Milton. The epic differs from the narrative in the encyclopedic range of its theme[7] [and] in encyclopedic forms we see how the conventional themes reappear as *episodes* of a larger story.[8]

Dynasty's structural clarity of epic form is utilized through the overall narrative structure which it shares in common with both daytime and nighttime serials. This structure is episodic and presented in serial form. In terms of structural linguistics[9] the distinction between episode and serial is significant. The episode presents us with a paradigm of substitutive, analogical relations, a bundle of relations at a given time (i.e., Saussure's synchronic, vertical dimension); while the serial, which links the episodes into one continuous story, illustrates the narrative's chain of signification as syntagmatic—the narrative thrust which, based on contiguous associative signifiers, pushes towards completion (i.e., Saussure's diachronic, horizontal dimension).

This formal distinction is especially useful in discussing *Dynasty*, for each episode is predicated upon our understanding of the condensation of epic form within a paradigm of family interrelationships elevated to the status of a "princely house." With this royal household, grand and dangerous passions are exhibited by members of the Carrington family. These "larger-than-life" passions rely on the narrative conventions of the serial genre in which representations of sexuality within the family are manifested as illegitimacy, bigamy, incest, and other problems of marriage and paternity. However, as a high mimetic nighttime serial, *Dynasty* combines epic form within its paradigm of character interrelationships. While character interrelationships are substantive conventions of the serial genre, the elevation of those conventions so as to create a "House of Carrington" are peculiar to *Dynasty*.

Dynasty's narrative, based on the serial form, relentlessly pushes forward, from week to week. In this sense, the narrative is open, inconclusive, never finished, for its syntagmatic dimension operates diachronically through time. Now, while the linkage of episodes through serialization is the overall structure common to both daytime and nighttime serials, through epic treatment *Dynasty*'s paradigmatic form as episodes about a "princely house" reflects its narrative function which entails the constant "furthering" of the narrative through serialization. This narrative function is related to the procreative function.

In a typical daytime serial the problem of procreation may be embedded in a variety of sub-plots, and expressed as a man's adultery based on a woman's infertility or as fertile and infertile women in competition for a man's affection. However, because *Dynasty*'s episodic structure is based on lineage within the nexus of characters who comprise a royal household, the show is able to elevate and foreground the importance of procreative power. Thus procreative power is a function of the narrative which is in the service of the episodic structure. Indeed, procreative power is hyperbolized through epic form and functions in the continuation of the narrative as a serial. This epic foregrounding of procreative power in *Dynasty* serves a narrative function

[7] Frye, p. 318.
[8] Frye, p. 324.
[9] My distinction between the episode as paradigmatic and the serial form as a syntagmatic furthering of the narrative is predicated upon Saussure's notion of *langue/parole*. *Langue* is synchronic, and vertical as the state of a language at a given time, while *parole* is diachronic, and horizontal as an utterance through time. See Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Wade Baskin (New York: The Philosophy Library, Inc., 1959). While Saussure's project was to examine both the historical and structural properties of language, Roman Jakobson sought to further Saussure's notion of the synchronic and diachronic axes of language through application to specific language disorders. This led Jakobson to a textual understanding of the paradigmatic dimension (a textual version of the synchronic) as aligned with poetry which uses metaphor and substitution, and the syntagmatic dimension (a textual version of the diachronic) common to prose which uses metonymies in a contiguous association of signifiers. See Roman Jakobson, "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasia," in Jakobson and Morris Halle, eds., *Fundamentals of Language* (The Hague: Mouton, 1956). Other explanations of the historical/textual developments within structural linguistics are offered in Terence Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977) and Robert Scholes, *Structuralism in Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

as a continuous story of generations. The syntagma, always pregnant, carries the Carrington's familial and narrational line forward—the serial form appropriately termed as a "saga" of a "proud and passionate family."

The Carrington family does not end, for its genealogy, embedded in the "princely house," extends forward as both a familial and narrational line of descent. This familial/narrational line of descent is the narrative's "life," and the narrative's "life" is dependent upon women—their procreative function which keeps the narrative alive. Indeed, the "larger-than-life" actions performed by the powerful women in *Dynasty* invariably involve the procreative function. Thus it would seem that the women's power lies in their ability to reproduce the narrative. Although feminine power as represented within *Dynasty* has a procreative function which propels the narrative forward, this function is in the service of a patriarchal structure and ideology which are tied to notions of property relations, inheritance, and the law of primogeniture.

In order to understand feminine power as procreative, it would be best first to provide a visual description of conflicts which revolve around the procreative function in a specific episode of *Dynasty*. The conflicts involving procreative power which inform this episode have been and continue to be used to further the show's overall narrative action. Hence, this particular episode, both visually and discursively, foregrounds issues dealing with procreation that are, in other episodes, perhaps expressed more subtly but present nonetheless.

Women and Power: The Procreative Function and The Kinship System

The two central events which inform this episode are, first, the confrontation between Krystle and Alexias in a hospital waiting room and, later, the graphic fight scene between the two women in Alexias' studio. Significantly, the confrontation foreshadows the fight, which is the climax of the episode. Thus, I will focus my analysis on these two events since the rivalry between Alexias and Krystle presents the clearest example of feminine power embodied in the procreative function.

The hospital waiting room scene opens with news of the birth of Fallon's son, and Blake, who has been sitting in the waiting room with Alexias and Krystle, leaves with Steven to call Jeff. Alexias and Krystle are left alone together, and Alexias exerts her power over Krystle both visually and verbally. Alexias dominates the frame through movement and position. As Krystle moves to the left-hand side of the couch to sit down, Alexias cuts in front of her, walking toward the Coke machine from screen-right to screen-left. Alexias maintains the superior position, standing with her back to the camera as she faces Krystle who is seated, looking down.

In a series of close-up shot-reverse-shots, Alexias nonchalantly taunts Krystle with the fact of her barrenness by using the birth of Fallon's son as a pretext. Her torture is slow and methodical, and foregrounds the centrality of the procreative function in this episode. The procreative function, as the measure of a woman's worth, finds its most mythic expression in the Bible where fertility is God's blessing: "He enthrones the barren woman in her house by making her the happy mother of sons" (Ps. 113:9).[10] The fertile woman attains queenly status by establishing a line of succession which serves to maintain power and property rights within the family. Hence, Alexias is able to effectively use Krystle's barrenness—her "unworthiness" as Blake's "consort"—as both a defensive and offensive weapon. Krystle has accused Alexias of lying about the car accident involving Alexias and Fallon, and Alexias, in a defensive maneuver, turns the argument around by shifting from her duplicity to Krystle's lack:

Alexias: Under the circumstances, you must be terribly upset.

[10] *The Jerusalem Bible* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966). All further citations will be taken from this edition.

Krystle: Circumstances?
Alexias: Fallon giving Blake what you're unable to give him. You must feel very left out—absolutely shattered!

Throughout this exchange, the dialogue is slow and protracted, while close-up shot-reverse-shots illustrate Alexias's superiority and Krystle's obvious pain. Krystle's inability to give Blake a child, which Alexias flaunts, illustrates the centrality of procreative power as a means by which men "extend" themselves through women. For Krystle to "give" Blake a child would mean that she has completed properly one step in the reproductive relations of production—her procreative power functioning to reproduce "Blake" through a child who could eventually enter the relations of production to extend Blake's empire. This system which reproduces the relations of production within the familial sphere has been termed the kinship system by Claude Lévi-Strauss in *The Elementary Structures of Kinship.*[11] Central to the kinship system is the exchange of women through marriage whereby women become the conduits between men first as daughters, then wives, then mothers. Gayle Rubin, in "The Traffic in Women," describes the kinship system as:

> an imposition of social ends upon a part of the natural world. It is therefore "production" in the most general sense of the term: a molding, a transformation of objects (in this case, people) to and by a subjective purpose. . . . It has its own relations of production, distribution, and exchange, which include certain "property" forms in people. These forms are not exclusive, private property rights, but rather different sorts of rights that various people have in other people.[12]

Rubin emphasizes that within a kinship system sexual access, genealogical statuses, lineal names and ancestors, rights, and men, women, and children are all subject to social relationships based on exchange; however, these relationships all reserve certain rights for men which women do not have. The imposition of a system of social organization upon the facts of biological procreation results in a naturalization of men's rights to women, rights that women do not have to themselves or to men.[13]

Significantly, the scene between Alexias and Krystle defines feminine power as procreativity, and seems to suggest that women *do* have rights to themselves and their biological function. This is not the case. Capitalist patriarchy, which expressly manifests itself through property relations and lineage in *Dynasty,* subsumes women's procreative abilities for use in furthering male dominance and ownership. Indeed, while it appears that women are vying for power as in the scene between Krystle and Alexias, the power they wield is for the right to Blake's name, the extension of his birthright and property rights. The importance of the extension of male birthright and male property rights is also illustrated in the scene between Fallon and Alexias which foregrounds the issue of questionable paternity. Fallon defines herself according to her birthright as Blake's daughter; lacking this, Fallon regards herself as tainted, as "nothing." Questionable paternity taints the line of descent by perverting it with possible incest and inbreeding. Similarly, the confrontation between Alexias and Sammy Jo expresses the importance of blood-line. Alexias blocks any possibility of a "tainted" blood-line by banishing Sammy Jo and thus protecting and repossessing her son, Steven. Thus, the feminine power the women fight for is not their own, but is rather male-defined. This is expressed in history as law. In *The History of English Law,* Pollock and Maitland maintain that, "the main idea which governs the law of husband and wife is not that of an 'unity of person,' but that of the guardianship, the *mund,* the profitable guardianship, which the husband has over the wife and over her property."[14]

[11]Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship,* trans. James Harle Bell and John Richard von Sturmer (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969).
[12]Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women,* ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), pp. 176–77.
[13]Rubin, p. 177.
[14]Sir Frederick Pollock and Frederic William Maitland, *The History of English Law,* 2nd ed., I (Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1923), p. 485.

Children are the essential link to men's property rights conducted through women. Indeed, Krystle is marked by the fact that she is barren and out of circulation within the system of exchange. She cannot be a mother, and, according to Alexias, she is "left out"—defined by negation within that system which assigns use-value to procreative ability. Barrenness is the curse of women. This is most clearly expressed in the Bible—a myth of origin which has ideological force. In the Bible, barrenness is a punishment for sin which is specifically a woman's sin. Indeed, Krystle's sin may entail her upward mobility achieved through marriage to Blake—a class shift which has especially enraged Alexias, whose "line" can be challenged by a "commoner" who is a competitor for succession. Although barrenness is women's punishment, women are able to redeem themselves and the race through childbearing. As stated in the Bible: "She will be saved by childbearing, provided she lives a modest life and is constant in faith and love and holiness" (1 Tim. 2:15).

Thus biological procreation, a natural function, is culturally transformed into a law. Procreation promises a woman redemption and insures man the survival of the race through his children, who are his property and the guarantee that his property will be extended. Psalm 127:3–5 says:

> Sons are the bounty from Yahweh,
> he rewards with descendants:
> like the arrows in a hero's hand
> are the sons you father when young
> Happy the man who has filled his quiver
> with arrows of this sort;
> in dispute with his enemies at the gate,
> he will not be worsted.

Children and property are linked throughout this passage, but the equation is most clearly expressed through the line "in dispute with his enemies at the gate," which literally means "when he speaks with his enemies in the gate, i.e., the gate of the city, where business is transacted" (*The New Jerusalem Bible*, note C, p. 915, trans. from *la Bible de Jerusalem* [Paris: la Editions du Cerf, 1961]). A father can use his sons to protect his property through business transactions. Through procreation, descendents concretize property rights. According to Blackstone, who cites the third absolute right of every Englishman as the right of private property: "The original of private property is probably founded in nature, . . . but certainly the modifications under which we at present find it, the method of conserving it in the present owner, and of translating it from man to man, are entirely derived from society."[15]

This translation of ownership from man to man is by no means arbitrary. It is rooted in the Law of Inheritance, rules of succession, and line of descent, all crucial to the inheritance of property and one's right to it by birth. This property claim, especially important to the aristocracy, was concretized as the Law of Primogeniture—the property rights of the first-born son. Significantly, the "natural" concept of primogeniture originates in the Bible: "He must acknowledge as first-born the son of the wife he does not love and give to him a double share of his estate, for his son is the first-fruit of his strength, and the right of the first-born is his" (Deut. 21:17). Later, primogeniture and its link to procreative power were subject to legal interpretations: "The right by primogeniture has long been established (except in cases of gavelkind [where all sons inherit] and other local customs), and was based mainly on the necessities of feudal tenure. But, in tracing the descent of land, it does not obtain among females."[16] The Law of Primogeniture encourages procreation, a natural function, for material ends. Moreover, as an epic construction, primogeniture emphasizes succession, the key to inheritance, which is peculiar to notions of the "princely house" or "royal dynasty."

[15]Sir William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Company, 1865), p. 100.

[16]*Encyclopedia of the Laws of England with Forms and Precedents*, 2nd ed., VII (Edinburgh: William Green & Sons, 1907), p. 243.

The Epic Battle as Dialectical: Insurrectionary Act/Erotic Spectacle

In *Dynasty*, the Law of Primogeniture is a significant narrative component, for it signifies economic as well as sexual potency. Primogeniture activates narrative lines of action by creating the conditions for family in-fighting, appropriate and integral to *Dynasty*'s epic representation of power relations exercised within the "princely house." For it is within the "princely house," the royal family structure of the dynasty, that inheritance means both power acquisition and maintenance through property relations—explicit terms for "larger-than-life" narrative action. This type of narrative action is perhaps best characterized in the graphic fight scene between Krystle and Alexias staged in Alexias's studio. The earlier skirmish and Krystle's revelation that Alexias caused her miscarriage and sterility set the scene for a titanic clash—a clash which combined sexual spectacle and epic battle over the right to the reproduction of Blake's name, his line.

The scene opens with a cut to a close-up of Alexias who says, looking off-screen right, "Well now, you look as if you're armed for battle." Krystle answers, "I am," and marches into the studio with Alexias's rifle pointed forward. Krystle occupies the dominant frame position, for she stands leaning toward Alexias who is seated to the left. Power positions have shifted from the earlier configuration in the waiting room which placed Krystle seated on the left. Moreover, the previously meek Krystle now wields Alexias's rifle which has been the subject of a phallic joke in the preceding scene (a close-up of Tony's hand reeming the gun followed by Joseph's exclamation, "Must you do *that* in the kitchen?").

The two women argue, and Krystle accuses Alexias of causing her miscarriage: "It wasn't a car that backfired, you were out shooting and you saw me riding and it was no accident." Alexias denies the accusation, calling Krystle "insane" as she moves further left and up the stairs to the second floor of her studio. Krystle pursues Alexias up the stairs and states, "You were jealous, jealous because I was going to give Blake a child and you couldn't stand that could you?" Alexias denies Krystle's accusation and insists "I didn't cause your accident, Krystle—just as I didn't cause your barrenness."

Thus, Alexias and Krystle's fight is predicated upon which one of them has the greater exchange-value as the one who can and the one who cannot "give Blake a child." Krystle, purposely de-valued by Alexias, engages Alexias in a battle based on the ability to reproduce—an ability and use-value which she now lacks. Krystle can no longer be used to perpetuate the reproduction of relations of production; Blake's line has been terminated through her, but extended through Alexias's children Fallon, Steven, and Adam.

The fight which ensues is both interesting and important in that it problematizes a neat, univocal reading of the action. Alexias and Krystle's fight fully manifests the earlier ambivalence of the representation of feminine power in a dynamic moment of dialectical tension. Initially, this tension was suggested through Alexias's (and later Krystle's) typically male dominance of the frame which opposed their procreative function, the consolidation of male property rights. However, the fight scene, hyperbolized as an epic battle through *Dynasty*'s epic form, graphically illustrates the full extent of feminine power in dialectical contradiction as simultaneously as insurrectionary act through the destruction of property and space, and as an erotic spectacle.

The Insurrectionary Act

Since the acquisition and maintenance of men's property rights are the end result of women's circulation within the kinship system, it is therefore somehow ironic that Krystle and Alexias, during the course of their battle over the reproduction of property relations, destroy property. Indeed, in a double, circular "sweep" of the studio, Krystle

and Alexias use furniture and household objects as weapons which are destroyed in the process of their utilization. A vase holding flowers can no longer be defined as a decorative object when Alexias hurls it at Krystle, just as a table is no longer a flat surface for books when Krystle slams Alexias against it. These household objects, pieces of property, are defined by their function. Thus when utilized as weapons, the vase becomes a projectile, the table a physical barrier. In the process of this new use, the household objects are destroyed; no longer even weapons, they are reduced to rubble which has no use.

During the course of Krystle and Alexias's fight, pieces of property that have exchange-value and use-value are reduced to nothing. In a sense, Krystle and Alexias are party to a momentary inversion of the very system of social relations that circulates them and oppresses them. Women and household objects are both defined by their exchange-value and use-value, linked together within a system of exchange that encourages a mutual identification under the auspices of property. However, when Krystle and Alexias destroy those household objects which are defined according to function, they also negate notions of exchange and use. Hence, analogically, since women and objects are part of the same system, and property is the material end of women's procreative power, then Krystle and Alexias's destruction of objects which are property foregrounds the mechanisms of the system that constrains them. Their destruction of property is not self-destructive, but rather an insurrectionary act whereby objects named according to cultural use are exposed for being named by function—which is to say, they function in name only (i.e., vase-projectile-rubble or woman-wife-mother).

The fight scene also presents, along with the destruction of property, the violation of space. The previously civilized space of the studio, which defined a woman's place within a domestic sphere, is levelled and flattened, the accoutrements of high culture broken up and demolished to create two planes of action (i.e., the upper and lower levels of the studio). Indeed, Krystle and Alexias "consume" the space of the studio through their wild movements as objects, clothes, furniture, and bedding are drawn into the fight and torn apart. Chairs and tables, which previously served as spatial markers indicating bodily placement in space, are smashed apart and scattered—no longer able to dictate proper boundaries. The women are barely contained within the space of the frame.

The camera, also consumed by their action, follows them in a double spiral that moves from Krystle's entrance right to left as she pursues Alexias up the left stairs, then to the right, down the right stairs, back to the left, once more up the left stairs, with Krystle finally exiting right. Thus, the space of the home—domestic space—is redefined as a place barely able to contain women's anger. Alexias and Krystle transgress the boundaries of proper behavior for women, just as they violate physical boundaries (in relation to each other) and spatial boundaries. This repudiation of the containment implicit in domestic space is a radical as well as a cathartic act; however, although domestic space is destroyed, reduced to planes of action, it is also subject to another redefinition as the space of an erotic spectacle.

The Erotic Spectacle

Indeed, if Alexias and Krystle's destruction of property and violation of space are insurrectionary and threatening, then it is the erotic spectacle, the manner in which they fight, that poses a dialectical counter-reading of the scene. It is in this sense that their fight is choreographed as an erotic dance with the camera, and thus subject to voyeuristic pleasure. The camera aestheticizes violence by exploiting the women's "seemingly" spontaneous and natural movements during the course of the fight. The positions which Krystle and Alexias are "thrown into" graphically illustrate a parallel with soft-core pornography through several shots which foreground a series of erotic poses that conflate pleasure with pain.

During the beginning of the fight the two

women struggle on the floor near the couch. As Krystle pushes Alexias onto the couch, Alexias's dress is pulled up to her thigh. Krystle and Alexias hit each other with pillows like little girls at a slumber party as feathers fly in all directions. Alexias is then pushed onto the floor by Krystle who rips her dress, with the sound magnified to make the act more graphic. The two women then wrestle in medium close-up rolling around from left to right and right to left in a tight "sexual" embrace.

Later, Krystle kicks Alexias to the left edge of the second level. Alexias rolls down the stairs and ends her fall stretched out provocatively on the floor, back to the camera, with feathers clinging to her. Alexias retaliates when from off-screen left she pulls Krystle off the couch by her legs, and Krystle, with hair disheveled and arms raised above her head, strikes an erotic pose that expresses pain and ecstasy. Alexias releases Krystle and falls into a chair in left-frame, her hair is wild and the left shoulder of her dress is torn.

Near the fight's conclusion, Krystle once more follows Alexias up the lefthand side stairs. She pushes Alexias into a corner and Alexias's dress is again raised to expose her leg. There is a cut to a close-up of Alexias hitting the wall. Her hair flies back and her mouth is sensuously open as she slides to the bottom of the frame, succumbing to the impact. Krystle, breathing hard (again a graphic use of sound) and in disarray covered with feathers, walks to the right, examines Alexias's banal portrait of Blake, and smashes it over a chair. Krystle then looks off-screen left in Alexias's direction and says, "If you want a re-match just whistle—if you can." There is a cut to a high-angle shot of the demolished studio littered with feathers, broken furniture, and other debris. Krystle walks to the right, and kicks broken furniture in her path as the camera moves down the right-hand side stairs with her exit.

The carefully choreographed erotic moments in this scene are foregrounded and hyperbolized through the epic battle of two "larger-than-life" female characters. Procreative power, as the means to attain property, is placed in question through the women's actions, their destruction of property; however, the *manner* in which these actions are staged and photographed re-position Krystle and Alexias within the system of exchange which their destructive actions would seek to challenge.

Thus, the fight scene graphically concretizes the dialectical tension posed by the ambivalent representation of powerful women within a patriarchal system of property relations. This dialectical tension is illustrated through Krystle and Alexias's rejection of property (i.e., they destroy the studio in their attempt to destroy each other) which conflicts with their visual representation as property (i.e., their erotic stylized poses). The eroticization of the fight scene makes it possible to ideologically recuperate this momentary insurrection under the auspices of the kinship system by representing the women as objects through the institution of pornography. The women's sexualized fight scene as a duplication of soft-core pornography is owned by the spectator's voyeuristic gaze. Further, because Krystle and Alexias battle over procreative rights, they also foreground their property-function (i.e., procreativity as a means to attain and maintain land).

Within a patriarchal structure, the exchange of women as a property-form and as having property-function renders any notion of feminine power mythic and ideological. The male dominated system of corporate capitalism must rely on the mythic underpinnings of women's fertility (i.e., woman's procreative worth) as a means to conduct and further property rights and relations through her. Indeed, procreative power, transformed into a function, serves as the analogical basis for notions of succession grounded in an ideology of corporatism:

> [I]n judgment of law a corporation never dies: and therefore the predecessors, who lived a century ago, and their successors now in being, are one and the same body corporate. Which identity is a property so inherent in the nature of the body politic, that, even when it is meant to give any thing taken to be in succession by such a

body, that succession need not be expressed: but the law will of itself imply it. . . . To have perpetual succession. This is the very end of [its] incorporation.[17]

Woman's biological reproductive powers, thus culturally transformed and used as an analogue for corporatism, function in the service of a patriarchal ideology that not only denies women autonomous rights to property, but also enlists them in the perpetuation of that very system and ideology which are the sources of their oppression.

Feminine power is further constructed as mythic and ideological through eroticism which sexualizes women's anger. Indeed, the competition between Krystle and Alexias is eroticized through their sexy sado-masochistic poses which perpetuate the myth of the Sadian woman, the "kitten with a whip" whose assertiveness brings pleasure and pain. Ideologically, this type of representation defines women's power as sexual and thus safely transforms and neutralizes women's anger and autonomy into the sado-masochistic or lesbian fantasies found in soft-core pornography—an industry dedicated to the exploitation of women through the complex mechanisms of erotic fantasy.

The Dialectic of Feminine Power

Although *Dynasty*'s epic form foregrounds the presentation of powerful women who wield feminine power, both the representation and function of feminine power are circumscribed and defined through patriarchal conceptions of myth and ideology. However, the other side of the dialectic which presents the destruction of property unsettles the patriarchal system, for Krystle and Alexias reveal, through their destruction of property, the functional mechanisms inherent in the system of exchange that places them as a property-form and as having a property-function. Women's destruction of property is perhaps a gesture so threatening that it must be eroticized and thus rendered safe within the context of an erotic spectacle analogous to soft-core pornography. Through the destruction of property and the repudiation of domestic space, Krystle and Alexias threaten the system which constrains them. Within the fight scene, this creates the dialectical tension which suggests itself to a double reading of the action.

A double reading of this dialectic of "feminine power" can prove illuminating if we use each term alternately to interpret the other term. If "femininity" is culturally determined through notions of procreation and eroticism, then "power" enacted as the destruction of property is a violation of the "feminine"—a subversion of the "feminine" label which places women within a system of exchange *to function as* procreators or erotic objects. However, Krystle and Alexias's momentary subversion of property relations in no way can be construed as a revision of *Dynasty*'s narrative. Indeed, the serial form of *Dynasty*'s narrative line of action, epic in scale, elevates the value and use of procreation as essential to the perpetuation of the narrative life of the "princely house." On the other hand, because procreation narratively is so important in relation to property, the destruction of property attains elevated significance—a significance so disruptive that only an eroticization of the action can put the women in their proper places as sexual and indisputably "feminine."

For finally, although the representation of women as power-holders in *Dynasty* is provisional and circumscribed through both the narrative context and a theoretical framework, the destructive use of power illustrated within the context of the fight scene momentarily asks us to rethink a conception of power through action, not gender. We need to interrogate the notion of the "feminine" when linked to "power," and we also need to examine "power" as an active principle—the power to act against the ideological constraints supported by myth, which systematize and naturalize the exchange of women.

Dynasty is important to such an ideological critique of feminine power in that as a model text of the nighttime serial genre it foregrounds the myths of corporate capital-

[17]Blackstone, pp. 348, 395.

ism through epic form, thereby elevating the women characters to positions of prominence. While *Dynasty* uses powerful and sexy women to move the narrative, such use entails the risk that the power invested in women as procreators and erotic objects will become too excessive, too stylized and hysterical to contain; indeed, power manifested in a destructive rampage critiques the system of exchange relations and, if only for a moment, creates anarchy within the "princely house." As representative of the epic nighttime serial genre with a twentieth-century American aristocracy comprised of corporate kings, queens, consorts, and mistresses, *Dynasty* presents instances of narrative de-stabilization, rupture, and contradiction through the actions of women invested with power. A dynasty, whether Jacobean or corporate, cannot function without women in positions of power based on reproduction in terms of both sex and business.

Thus, when interrogating the narrative mechanisms which foreground the representation and function of power in other nighttime serials, we would do well to investigate feminine power. For feminine power, as dialectical, may provide examples of narrative disjunctures which could serve as inroads into an analysis of how power is both ideologically and mythically constructed as a system which reproduces the relations of production. In short, in the seamless world of narrative construction where devices, structures, and operations are masked, the *Dynasty* women may enable us to locate the points at which those seams are most blatantly exposed.

IDEOLOGY AND TELEVISION NEWS: A METAPHORIC ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL STORIES

Dennis K. Mumby and Carole Spitzack

Language plays a fundamental role in the structuring of experience. Social realities are constituted, sedimented, and reified for members of a community through discourse. To this extent it is impossible to separate reality from reality-as-described; reality is intersubjectively constructed. Among the main socializing agents participating in this construction process are the mass media, within which television news serves as one of the principal disseminators of information, contributing significantly to the shaping of cultural norms and beliefs.[1] The news-making process as such thus is inherently ideological, functioning as a means by which the world can be "framed" in a particular way. This framing technique need not be seen as deliberate, but rather as a way of reflecting an objective and pre-existing reality; i.e., news is simply a "window on the world."

One way of productively addressing the ideological thrust of news is to examine the language through which stories are presented. This paper sets up a framework for language analysis which articulates the perspectival view of the world that television news offers. The notion of a perspectival world-view is not meant to suggest a subjective reading of news stories, but rather reflects the degree to which news, as an integral part of the acculturation process, continually reproduces and focuses the dominant ideology, and hence partly defines the perception of a particular event for the viewer. As we suggest below, this process of selective perception is not achieved through any form of coercion, but rests on the ability of television news to frame stories in such a way that selective interpretations are given active assent by viewers.

The method of analysis adopted is grounded in Lakoff and Johnson's theory of metaphor. Here, metaphors are not seen as purely stylistic devices; rather, they are integral to the way in which social reality is constructed. From this perspective, experience is shaped metaphorically.[2] A metaphoric analysis of television news can therefore be seen as one way to illustrate how news language structures experience, and hence as a method of focusing upon its hegemonic qualities. The emphasis in this paper thus lies not in making generalizable claims about the dominant ideologies in television news, but rather in demonstrating the relative merit of metaphoric analysis as a way to articulate the ideological qualities of news language.

This paper includes a discussion of "news as ideology" and a brief presentation of Lakoff and Johnson's theory of metaphor. A case study of a small corpus of political news stories is subjected to metaphoric analysis in order to exemplify the approach adopted.

Dennis Mumby is a Doctoral Candidate in the Department of Speech Communication, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. Carole Spitzack is an Instructor of Speech Communication at Tulane University, New Orleans. *An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Speech Communication Association Annual Convention, Louisville, KY, November 1982.*

[1]See, for example, Raymond Williams, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (London: Fontana, 1974); and James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, eds., *Mass Communication and Society* (Open University Press, London: Edward Arnold, 1977).

[2]George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 34 (Fall 1983), 162-171

News as an Ideological Form

Gaye Tuchman, in her book *Making News*, describes the news process in the following manner:

> News is a window on the world. Through this frame, Americans learn of themselves and others, of their own institutions, leaders, and life styles, and those of other nations and their peoples . . . But, like any frame that delineates a world, the news frame may be considered problematic. The view through a window depends upon whether the window is large or small, has many panes or few, whether the glass is opaque or clear, whether the window faces a street or a backyard. The unfolding scene depends upon where one stands, far or near, craning one's neck to the side or gazing straight ahead, eyes parallel to the wall in which the window is encased.[3]

Tuchman's use of the "window" metaphor brings into sharp focus an element of the newsmaking process that is often neglected by current mass media research; news as a "window on the world" presents itself largely as a reflection of an objectively existing reality when, in fact, that reality is constructed. From this perspective, institutions of the mass media (and for our purposes, TV news) are socializing forces which present a particular and rather narrow view of the world to the television viewer, and are thus inherently ideological. This position runs counter to the prevailing trends in mass communication research which, by and large, ignore the problems associated with "reality presentation," and concentrate rather on issues such as agenda setting,[4] uses and gratifications,[5] opinion formation,[6] and effects research.[7] In all of these approaches the question of the media as ideological forms remains largely untouched.

The notion of news as ideology, however, needs to be placed initially within a larger framework. Mass media understood as socializing forces must be located in an interplay of the various institutions which collectively articulate the prevailing cultural belief systems. These belief systems, though generally tacit, enable individuals to make sense of their positions in the social world; in other words, social reality is conceptualized and experienced by each person within the parameters of a certain hegemony. Thus, when Gramsci develops the notion of ideological hegemony, he refers to the way in which the dominant classes succeed in framing all competing definitions of reality within their range, bringing all alternatives within their horizon of thought.[8]

Gitlin adopts Gramsci's concept of hegemony in his analysis of the ideological functions of prime time television entertainment.[9] He demonstrates the ways in which ideological hegemony is embedded in the format of television shows. By analyzing formal structures such as formula, genre, setting, slant, and solution, he is able to explicate the way in which television systematically frames and packages the meaning systems of dominant social groups.[10] In this context, not only is the dominant ideology perpetuated, but, in addition, its ability to adapt to societal changes allows alternative and oppositional ideologies to be continually brought within its purview. Hence:

[3]Gaye Tuchman, *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality* (New York: Free Press, 1978), p. 1.

[4]See Erwin L. Atwood, Ardyth B. Sohn, and Harold Sohn, "Daily Newspaper Contributions to Community Discussion," *Journalism Quarterly*, 55 (1978), 570–76; and Gerald C. Stone and Maxwell E. McCombs, "Tracing the Time Lag in Agenda-Setting," *Journalism Quarterly*, 58 (1981), 51–55.

[5]See Elihu Katz, Jay G. Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch, "Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual," in *Interpersonal Communication and the Mass Media*, eds. Gary Gumpert and Robert Cathcart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 214–28.

[6]See Hanna Adoni, "The Functions of Mass Media in the Political Socialization of Adolescents," *Communication Research*, 6 (1979), 84–106; and Alan M. Rubin, "Child and Adolescent Television Use and Political Socialization," *Journalism Quarterly*, 55 (1978), 125–29.

[7]See "Effects of Television," *Journal of Communication*, 27 (1977), 175–221 (Special Issue); and Steven H. Chaffee, "Mass Media Effects: New Research Perspectives," in *Mass Communication Review Yearbook Vol. I*, ed. G. Cleveland Wilhoit and Harold de Bock (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980), pp. 77–108.

[8]Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971).

[9]Tod Gitlin, "Prime Time Ideology: The Hegemonic Process in Television Entertainment," *Social Problems*, 26 (1979), 251–266.

[10]Ibid., pp. 254–263.

In liberal capitalism, hegemonic ideology develops by domesticating opposition, absorbing it into forms compatible with the core ideological structure. Consent is managed by absorption as well as exclusion. The hegemonic ideology changes in order to remain hegemonic; that is the peculiar nature of the dominant ideology of liberal capitalism.[11]

The notion of alternative world-views being assimilated into the dominant system is useful because it reflects the conditions of the news-making process, in which news programs maintain a continuous effort to present a coherent image of an otherwise diffuse world.

Mass media, therefore, perform the process of classifying the world in terms of the discourse of the dominant ideologies. This is not to suggest that the media are deliberately and overtly partisan; on the contrary, their role is such that they simply operate "within the mode of reality of the state."[12] This role, however, is not a passive one; the media participate actively to define our world. Hall, for example, posits three principal and interrelated functions of the media: (1) the provision and selective construction of social knowledge through which we can reconstruct our lives and those of others into a "world of the whole, some lived totality"; (2) a reflection of the apparent plurality of social life: "to provide a constant inventory of the lexicons, life styles and ideologies which are objectivated there [in the media]"; (3) a bringing together in some systematic manner of that which has been selectively represented and classified, i.e., the production of consensus and legitimacy, together with the whole process of argument, consultation, and speculation by which it emerges.[13]

These three functions point to some of the issues that need to be addressed in examining the language of television news. Specifically, the theory of metaphor that we adopt must, if it is to have any heuristic value, be able to demonstrate ways in which the structuring of language lends itself to and instantiates ideological hegemony. Tuchman describes news language in the following manner: "Yet, clearly, the language of news prose contains a special relationship to the everyday world, for, like any other language, it both frames and accomplishes discourse. It is perception and it guides our perception; it reconstitutes the everyday world."[14]

Metaphoric analysis, then, must be concerned with an explication of the ways in which news language guides perception. Furthermore, because perception is grounded in experience, metaphoric analysis must make explicit the experiential and conceptual base which underlies discourse. In other words, the approach adopted articulates a method for deconstructing language that is perceptually sedimented. As Deetz states, "To describe the systematicity of talk is to present this structure in another form—to make it unfamiliar so it can be examined."[15] It is through this process of "making strange" that metaphoric analysis can provide a way of exemplifying the ideological frame through which television news presents a certain picture of the world. If, for example, it is shown that certain metaphors are used consistently, then it can be argued that viewers are asked to draw upon particular domains of experience to make sense of news stories. Such a structuring of language suggests a nonarbitrary framing of reality within a particular ideological meaning system. The theoretical underpinnings of the model of analysis are outlined below.

An Experiential View of Metaphor

Both Tuchman and Gitlin provide systematic means of explicating the ideological framework through which television defines social reality. Lakoff and Johnson's theory of metaphor provides similar possibilities. A brief example from our study will help to illustrate.

[11]Ibid., p. 263.
[12]Stuart Hall, "Culture, the Media and the 'Ideological Effect'," in Curran et al., p. 346.
[13]Ibid., pp. 340–342.
[14]Tuchman, p. 107.
[15]Stanley Deetz, "Hermeneutics, Textuality, and Communication Research," paper presented to the Summer Institute on Communication Theory, University of Washington, Seattle, August 1980, p. 17.

In the analysis we found that the phrase "a full report" was used by the anchorman to introduce three of the six news items. The repeated use of this phrase is significant because of its implications for the purpose and scope of news reporting. In this instance, the suggestion is that the report to follow will not simply present a certain perspective of the event discussed, but will say *all* there is to say about that event. A container metaphor is in operation here; our everyday experience with objects that hold substances is brought to bear on our understanding of what it means to convey ideas or facts in a comprehensive fashion. When we say that a container is full, we recognize that no more of the given substance can be put in. Similarly, the phrase "a full report" implies that the report (container) can incorporate no more facts (the substance). Phrases in a similar vein which might be used include:

Information is *pouring in*
We'll *fill in* the rest of the story later
The facts *are mounting*
So far we are *low on facts*

In the case of this metaphoric system, our experience of a particular kind of material object (container) allows us to understand the news process in a concrete manner. From an ideological perspective, the use of the container metaphor points toward the way in which news is conceptualized. Not only does it provide a "window on the world," but it structures it in a certain way, i.e., in a linear fashion. Facts become objects which are strung together in order to "fill" a particular "space" (container) on the program. Hence news items are conceptually reified, lending themselves more easily to categorization and comprehension.

This example lends support to Lakoff and Johnson's claim that "metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. . . . on the contrary, human *thought processes* are largely metaphorical. This is what we mean when we say that the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined. Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person's conceptual system."[16]

Rather than locating metaphor solely in words, Lakoff and Johnson argue that the very thought processes of individuals are metaphorical. Providing systematicity to experience and language, metaphor gives structure to the lived-world of the everyday actor. The level of meaning progresses beyond words and sentences to encompass the speech act and total speech situation. Such a radical shift announces that language is not a cognitive addition to human experience, but that daily interactions are interpreted by virtue of an already developed conceptual system. Reality, then, is not only structured by metaphor but is often given metaphorically.

Language and experience are thus so intertwined that it becomes impossible to examine either in isolation. Attempts to delineate these boundaries in the pursuit of objectivity require a systematic transcendence of person from lived-world, resulting in theorizing that has little contact with the lives of community members. The temptation to identify the conceptual position as purely subjective is equally limiting and must be rejected. To relativize linguistic systems in this way not only ignores the vitality of language, but locates meaning "inside the head," thus crippling one in understanding the world and its inherent contribution to this process. Lakoff and Johnson turn, rather, to an intersubjective view of language which suggests that understanding or meaning emerges in a dialectic relationship inclusive of self, world, and others.

Lakoff and Johnson's theory of metaphor takes the form "A is B." That is, we understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another.[17] In essence, this conceptual view of metaphor presupposes a projection across domains. Fields of experience

[16]Lakoff and Johnson, p. 6. For a further development of this conceptual view of metaphor, see Lakoff and Johnson, "The Metaphorical Structure of the Human Conceptual System," *Cognitive Science*, 4 (1980), 195–208.

[17]Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, p. 5.

which are not normally viewed as compatible are brought together in a coherent manner to provide a particular way of conceptualizing a person, object, or event. This is not to say that a certain metaphor will give a complete structuring to a particular experience; rather, metaphors perform a partial structuring of concepts and hence function to highlight (and, by implication, hide) certain features of a particular concept. In other words, "In allowing us to focus on one aspect of a concept . . . a metaphorical concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor."[18] For example, a political news story that is characterized by war metaphors ("Reagan fiercely attacked the opposition," "Weinberger staunchly defended the government's nuclear arms policy") may cause us to lose sight of other, more cooperative aspects of politics which require us to draw on different domains of experience ("The USA and USSR are working toward the common goal of world peace," "The House moved closer to an agreement on the 1983 Budget"). In the latter examples, politics is characterized in terms of a journey which entails mutual cooperation rather than opposition.

When a concept is structured by more than a single metaphor, various metaphors frequently fit together in a coherent manner. This coherence *between* metaphors is referred to as external systematicity, or external coherence.[19] It is grounded in the fact that different metaphors often partly share the experiential domains in which they are based. The two metaphors, *politics is war* and *politics is a game*, for example, both draw on our experience of winning and losing, using strategies, maintaining morale, and so forth. These two metaphors thus structure the way we conceptualize politics in different but overlapping ways. Similarly, each metaphor is internally coherent in the sense that every use of a particular metaphor draws on more of the entailments that make up the experiential domain in which the metaphor is rooted.

The ability of metaphors to systematically highlight certain aspects of a concept while hiding others is a key element in our argument. Metaphors are not simply stylistic devices; they actually structure experience. Given this view, the systematic use of a certain metaphor in describing an event may lead to a very particular understanding of that event. As such, we can speak of "metaphoric entrapment": The way in which a concept is understood becomes so tied up with a particular metaphoric structure that alternative ways of viewing that concept are obscured, or else appear to make less sense. In the context of television news, therefore, metaphoric analysis can point to the domains of experience that are called forth by news language and hence can address its ideological character.

The case study that follows can be seen as a exemplar of the way in which metaphoric analysis demonstrates the perspectival view of the world that news language presents. The study does not make generalizable claims, but attempts to provide insight into the structuring of experience that is suggested by the stories analyzed.

A Metaphoric Analysis of Television News

Six political stories from ABC's *World News Tonight* were chosen for analysis. A "political story" was defined as any news event which relates directly to government activity, or to the activity of those people involved in the administration of government. Within each story, only the language of reporters and anchorperson was analyzed. As such, we concentrated specifically upon the ways in which the *mediators* of news structure their language. The six news items to be analyzed were labeled in the following manner: (1) AWACS senate vote; (2) OPEC price negotiations; (3) King Hussein's visit to the White House; (4) White House foreign policy controversy; (5) Reagan Budget policy; and, (6) Administration feud.

[18]Ibid., p. 10.
[19]Ibid., pp. 97-105.

Table 1

Occurrence of the Principal Metaphors in Six Newsstories

	Politics Is War	*Politics Is A Game*	*Politics Is a Drama*	*Total*
AWACS Senote Vote	35	30	9	74
OPEC Negotiations	4	3	1	8
King Hussein	21	5	6	32
White House Policy	19	5	0	24
Reagan Budget Policy	8	4	2	14
Administration Feud	9	1	3	[illegible]
Total	96	48	21	16[illegible]

Each item was transcribed and subject to metaphoric analysis. The method adopted was content analysis, using the Q-sort technique. This allowed the collected metaphors to be thematized according to the various metaphoric vehicles. Particular clusters of metaphors emerged from the analysis. The three principal metaphoric clusters were: *politics is war, politics is a game,* and *politics is a dramatic performance.* To say that politics is war, for example, means that the way in which we conceptualize politics is partially structured by our knowledge and experience of war. The distribution of the metaphors is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 gives us some idea of the spread of metaphors, but their distribution is largely peripheral to our concerns, because it is difficult to gauge the effect of metaphors in a quantitative manner. The fact that there are twice as many war metaphors as game metaphors, for example, does not mean that viewers are doubly likely to conceptualize politics in terms of war. In some instances, it is possible for a single metaphor to contextualize an entire story. Thus, when a news anchorperson describes a news item as a "story" the pieces of information in that item will be seen as coherently relating an event to the viewer, even though it may consist of fragmented, largely disparate "facts" gleaned from several unconnected sources.

Examples of the three different metaphors are given below, followed by a partial list of entailments which help to characterize the realm of experience each metaphor draws.

Politics is a Game

And so the President *had won*
The White House *lobbying team which won the day* contained both *first and second rate players*
the one Washington *player who doesn't lose* discounted by some because he often seems *so fumbling* arrived at the White House *still opposed to* Camp David
the strategy of the possible use of nuclear weapons
All members of his foreign policy team must *cooperate and work closely together*
Today's meeting *may produce that result*
a rival in foreign policy matters

Entailments:

1. Games involve players.
2. Games involve role-playing.
3. Games involve play.
4. Games are often won or lost.
5. Games involve competition.
6. Games have teams.
7. Games involve cooperation between teammates.
8. Games have rules.
9. Games involve varying degrees of skill.
10. Games involve the use of strategy.
11. Games often have spectators.

These entailments to some extent map out the conceptual framework that is involved when a game metaphor is used. In such cases, our knowledge and personal experience of what it means to play a game are brought to bear on our understanding of politics. The entailments of the game metaphor predispose people to experience politics as consisting of certain qualities. For example, participants in games are generally seen as non-serious, in the sense of "playing out" an activity which does not require full personal commit-

ment. Phrases such as "It's only a game" reflect the fact that a person's level of skill, for instance, cannot be used to evaluate that individual as a person. In this sense, participants are judged by the skill of their performance rather than by their intrinsic qualities.

If political stories are reported using an abundance of game metaphors, then viewers may interpret the story within that context. This does not mean that the viewer must be consciously aware of the metaphoric structures used; on the contrary, important to our position is the notion that much of what is said in news broadcasts will be interpreted literally rather than metaphorically. However, the only way in which a phrase like "the one Washington player who doesn't lose" can be understood is if one understands the concepts of "playing" and "winning." Furthermore, these concepts must make sense when they are used within (in this case) a political context. Therefore, one domain of experience (politics) is structured in terms of another (games).

Politics is War

A *prime target*—Gorton of Washington
Alan Cranston, *leader of the opposition*
had this sale been *defeated*
Senator Zanowski *succumbed* and voted with him, helping to hand Ronald Reagan *a victory*
Israel *never fought* President Reagan or *tried to hurt* his prestige
Republicans *are running for cover* and Democrats *are letting fly from all sides*
Mr. Reagan may be *sticking to his plans*
A top White House aide has been *running a guerrilla campaign against him* for nine months
he may then have to *knock some heads together*

Entailments:

1. War involves two or more enemies.
2. War involves strategies.
3. War involves attacks.
4. War involves the use of weapons.
5. War has leaders.
6. War involves conflict.
7. War usually ends in victory or defeat.
8. War involves violence.
9. War involves a struggle for domination.
10. War is dangerous.

This group of metaphors conceptualizes politics in a way that is somewhat different from the game metaphor. Here, the emphasis centers more upon the conflict often associated with political activity. The idea of healthy competition becomes subordinated to the rivalry of those people in positions of power. The prolific use of war metaphors by reporters thus tends to promote an image of politics in which aggression, victory or defeat, and unhealthy conflict are viewed as "normal," while cooperation, friendliness, and mutual understanding are deemphasized. Furthermore, a state of war transcends the normal operating rules of society; in this sense, politicians are given licence to act in ways that would, in other circumstances, transgress the bounds of acceptable behavior. Within this context, they assume a privileged position in society.

Politics is a Dramatic Performance

There was *little suspense* about Gorton
Finally the vote . . . was *an anti-climax*
a *well-orchestrated*, low-profile position
For the story, we go to our foreign desk in London
Once upon a time when King Hussein met new Presidents
But if Hussein does *play a lesser role*
But inside there lurks for Haig *a character assassin*
For his part, Mr. Reagan wants to dissuade the King
This balancing act between the two moved to the Oval Office

Entailments:

1. Dramatic performances have scripts.
2. Dramatic performances have actors.
3. Dramatic performances involve roles.
4. Dramatic performances have a beginning, middle, and end.
5. Dramatic performances have an audience.
6. Dramatic performances require sets.
7. Dramatic performances are representational.
8. Dramatic performances are staged.

Although the drama metaphor is not as prevalent as the game and war metaphors, it still occurs frequently enough to be of significance. Here, the emphasis is upon politics as a staged event, in which the participants play specific roles and behave according to a particular "script." This is most apparent in

the first news item concerning the AWACS vote. The whole story is reported as if it is a suspense drama, with the denouement centering on the President's ability to get the necessary number of votes. One of the strengths of the drama metaphor thus lies in its ability to conceptualize politics in terms of a story to be related to an audience.

The role of the reporter-as-narrator is also of central concern in this metaphor. The position that news reporters take up in the "cast of characters" is one which reflects their role as presenters of facts; that is, the narrator is one who explains the action that unfolds onstage, but he or she takes no direct part in this action. This same function can be assigned to reporters; their job is usually described as the simple presentor of facts—no part is played in the actual creation of newsworthy events.

External Systematicity

The metaphors discussed do not exist in a mutually exclusive relationship. Although each structures our perception of politics in a different way (highlighting some aspects and hiding others), all three share entailments, providing external systematicity among them. This external systematicity shows that the domains of experience from which the metaphors are drawn are integrated in some way. In the case of the war and game metaphors, both share the entailment of involving success and failure (among others). The sharing of entailments means that people can talk about politics in certain ways using metaphors drawn from both areas of experience. Intense political conflict can be conceived as the playing out of a game in which, although people may be enemies, no one is physically harmed. Debates may be lost but each participant "lives to fight another day." Political opponents may even be viewed not as enemies of each other, but simply as people who happen to be on "opposing teams." The fact that victory for either on a particular issue might affect the lives of millions of people is partially obscured by the translation of conflict into game playing.

The external systematicity existing between the *politics is a dramatic performance* metaphor and both other metaphorical structures is perhaps less apparent, but nevertheless is present to some extent. In relation to the game metaphor, for example, the areas of experiential integration mainly involve the structured nature of both events. Dramatic performance follow a script, games are played according to a set of rules; both are enacted or played out in front of an audience; and both involve actors or players who are assigned particular roles.

In terms of examples which illustrate this mutual entailment, our stories provided some instances in which images of politicians as both players *and* actors were present. Thus Reagan's "lobbying team" is said to contain "both first- and second-rate players," while Reagan himself, although "so fumbling" at times, is seen as "the one Washington player who doesn't lose." Here, while "lobbying team" is clearly a game metaphor, the use of "players" can refer to both acting and game-playing. Similarly, the term "fumbling" can be used in relation to either the handling of a ball or the speaking of lines. Referring to Reagan as a "player" who "doesn't lose" seems to be predominantly a game metaphor, although the image could be one of an actor with a string of successful performances behind him, especially given Reagan's former profession. Again, these examples show how the overlapping of experiential domains produces metaphors which allow another field of experience to be understood simultaneously as both a game and a dramatic performance without any sense of paradox.

External systematicity between the drama and war metaphors is perhaps harder to articulate. The problem here may lie in the fact that drama is generally perceived as representational, and therefore not "real-life," while war is viewed as very much the real thing, i.e., literally a matter of life and death. Integration of the two domains is possible, however, if one adopts our position and sees war in terms of game-playing.

Then, war becomes more akin to drama in respect to its relationship with reality. One can get a sense of this in the following example: "But inside there lurks for Haig a character assassin." Here, we must draw on our experience of both war and drama simultaneously to understand the phrase "character assassin," but at the same time there is the realization that a character is never really killed. In essence, the interplay between the two words negates the possibility of actual harm, and replaces it instead with a dramatic alternative. Haig himself is not threatened; only the role which he enacts is. The conceptualization of war as a game/drama enables us to perceive aggressive behavior in a more ritualistic sense, and not as intrinsically detrimental to society.

The fact that the metaphors do not exist in a mutually exclusive relationship points toward the degree to which they are able to structure experience in a coherent manner. In the news items analyzed, we are not presented with a single, consistent, concrete image of politics. Instead, we are required to draw upon several experiential domains, each of which allows us to understand a certain aspect of the concept of politics. The complex coherences across metaphors create a holistic view of politics, rather than a fragmented one.[20]

From an ideological perspective, all three metaphors share an entailment which reflects the relationship between politics and social reality. A suspension of the normal "rules of life" is implicit in all three cases. That is, because people are judged on the basis of their role enactment (in a battle, in a game, or on stage), they are not required to display behavior associated with someone who lives within the parameters defined by society as constituting "normal" behavior. In this sense, political behavior (as reported) can be considered extra-societal.

Furthermore, the pre-eminence of role performance over genuinely committed activity leads to the creation of what might be termed an "ideology of impersonality." Television news suggests that because politicians are defined by the role that they play, they cannot be held "personally" responsible for the effects of their actions. This becomes most clear in the distinction that is made between "private" and "public" life. Intimate glimpses of the President "at home" are contextualized in terms of "Reagan the man" as opposed to "Reagan the politician."

Similarly, the idea of image-building is central to the ideology of impersonality. The persona that is created for a politician is always recognized as existing purely at a political level; it is that which gives the politician licence to act in a certain way without those actions reflecting upon him or her as a "person." An official can act in the most extreme manner, but still be considered a "nice guy" who is "only doing his job." It is interesting that news reports will, for example, talk about the President's attempts to build a "better image" with the black community, while simultaneously failing to question the cosmetic nature of such an image change. There is the implicit recognition that images are altered for the sake of political survival, but the ethics of these actions are not addressed.

The three metaphors thus collectively contribute to the creation of a certain political reality through the ideology of impersonality. Alternative realities, however, are possible. This can be demonstrated by introducing a metaphor that conceptualizes politics in a different way. For example, we can view *politics as a work of art.* Drawing upon our experiences of works of art, reporters might say the following:

The President's brush strokes were clearly evident in the amendment to the Bill

Reagan has chiselled away at the rough rock of the Budget until he has achieved the desired form

[20]In this context, Bormann's notion of the rhetorical vision illustrates how one can experience a way of life in which one does not directly participate. See Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58 (1972), 396-407; and Ernest G. Bormann, Jolene Koester, and Janet Bennett, "Political Cartoons and Salient Rhetorical Fantasies: An Empirical Analysis of the '76 Presidential Campaign," *Communication Monographs*, 45 (1978), 317-329.

The administration's policy on Central America is ugly to behold compared with the aesthetic beauty of the Democratic alternative

The AWACS vote illustrated Reagan's genius for shaping results to his own satisfaction

The garish colors of Reagan's foreign policy contrast sharply with the more subtle hues of the Carter administration's

That these examples seem odd is not surprising. They require us to bring to bear our knowledge of works of art and, as such, ask us to understand politics in a way very different from that of the other three metaphors. Some of the metaphoric entailments are:

1. Politics is an aesthetic experience.
2. Politics involves creativity.
3. Politics involves different artistic techniques.
4. Politics requires an element of genius.
5. Politics can give insight.
6. Politics requires dedication and commitment.
7. Politics can be judged aesthetically.

Because metaphors have the power to create new realities, this alternative metaphor allows us to experience a different political reality. While the other three metaphors are grounded in areas of experience which overlap to some degree (providing coherence between metaphors), this metaphor is derived from a domain of experience largely unrelated to the others (although it has entailments in common with the drama metaphor). Most significant, conceptualizing politics in terms of art radically departs from the view of politics as role playing. If we conceive of the politician as artist, then he or she is transformed from the passive, impersonal performer of a role to an active creator of social policy. The use of such a metaphor enables one to make politicians as individuals more directly responsible for their actions. In addition, this example demonstrates that the particular view of politics that television news promulgates can be countered by developing alternative metaphoric structures.

Conclusion

The principal thrust of this paper does not lie in an attempt to produce a definitive analysis of metaphors used in television news. Its goal is rather to demonstrate that what is seen as real in television news is not wholly external to, or independent of, the way people conceptualize the world. The theory of metaphor adopted privileges this view by articulating the degree to which "Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature."[21] If this is the case, then metaphoric analysis can provide insight into the news process by showing that the reality presented there is dependent upon the metaphoric structures used. Metaphor is so pervasive in everyday life that it is often taken to *literally* describe the world. But the analysis of the small corpus of news stories suggests that what is presented is not "the way things are," but rather one possible world-view among many. The creation of alternative metaphoric structures indicates that reality is not predefined, but dependent on the relationship between language and experience. If reality only exists as described, then metaphoric analysis uncovers the experiential domains upon which such descriptions are based.

We can therefore say that television news is ideological because it continually presents a perspectival view of the world, while simultaneously absorbing alternative or oppositional realities. Metaphoric analysis holds possibilities for exposing this process both by articulating the way in which reality is linguistically structured, and by presenting alternatives to such structuring, as in the case of the *politics is a work of art* metaphor. Novel metaphors thus perform the function of concept formation, thereby expanding the lived-world of the social actor.

[21] Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, p. 3.

ROBERT SCHULLER: THE AMERICAN DREAM IN A CRYSTAL CATHEDRAL

Martha Solomon

"Love yourself—and your dreams can come true."[1]
"Move Ahead with Possibility Thinking."[2]
"Play the Possibility Thinking Game—And Win."[3]
"Success is building self esteem in yourself and others through sincere service . . . success *is* self-respect."[4]

Robert Schuller, minister of the Garden Grove Community Church in California, is by all estimates one of the most successful television evangelists as well as one of the most controversial. Starting atop the refreshment stand of a drive-in theatre, Schuller has built his congregation to 9,000 members housed in his Crystal Cathedral.[5]

His message of "possibility thinking" and his attempt to market religion, however, have provoked strong criticism. Some charge he is "selling indulgences,"[6] others that he uses too much "show biz" and "razzle dazzle" on his programs,[7] others that his message is either theologically "thin gruel"[8] or even a spiritual tranquilizer.[9] Defenders point out that Schuller reaches the "unchurched," attracting them to the church with his doctrine of "possibility thinking."[10] Schuller describes himself as a "show barker who cries out to the unchurched 'Come in here, there's something good inside for you.' "[11] His associate pastor, Dr. Raymond Beckering, part of Schuller's 200-person staff at Garden Grove, remarks: "He has been eminently successful in whetting the appetite and bringing people to Christ, and then from that point on, entrusting the nurturing process . . . to the staff here."[12] Still, even hostile observers agree that Schuller is a notch above other television evangelists. After satirizing Schuller's flamboyant style, John Mariani concluded, "Schuller is by far the most palatable of the TV preachers, as well as the best showman."[13] In *Christian Century* Wilfrid Bockelman, after weighing the pros and cons of Schuller's ministry, questioned whether Schuller was concocting the "right kind of pudding" for his followers and concluded: "And if the answer should be No, then we are left with two equally difficult questions: Why do so many people like it? And who on the church scene is providing something more nourishing?"[14] Although the second question posed by Bockelman might stimulate a lively general discussion, the first is an appropriate challenge for rhetorical scholars.

With the recent prominence and alleged power of the so-called electric church, television ministries of all types deserve close

Martha Solomon is Associate Professor of Speech Communication at Auburn University.

[1]Robert Schuller, *Self Love: The Dynamic Force of Success* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1981), p. 48.
[2]Robert Schuller, *Move Ahead with Possibility Thinking* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1980).
[3]Robert Schuller, *You Can Become the Person You Want To Be* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1976), p. 62.
[4]Robert Schuller, *Reach Out for New Life* (New York: Bantam Books, 1979), p. 10.
[5]Jan Roorda, "A Call to Live Joyously," *Saturday Evening Post*, April 1978, p. 56.
[6]T. D. Allman, "Blessings to Go: Jesus in Tomorrowland," *New Republic*, 27 November 1976, p. 8.
[7]John Mariani, "Television Evangelism: Milking the Flock," *Saturday Review*, 3 February 1979, p. 25.
[8]Browne Barr, "Finding the Good at Garden Grove," *Christian Century*, 4 May 1977, p. 425; Wilfred Bockelman, "The Pros and Cons of Robert Schuller," *Christian Century*, 20–27 August 1975, p. 735.
[9]David Singer, "The Crystal Cathedral: Reflections of Schuller's Theology," *Christianity Today*, 8 August 1980, p. 29.
[10]Barr, p. 425.
[11]Singer, p. 28.
[12]Ibid., p. 28.
[13]Mariani, p. 22.
[14]Bockelman, p. 735.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 34 (Fall 1983), 172–186

critical scrutiny.[15] Schuller, as the most successful, one of the earliest, and, to many, the most palatable of this group, seems to merit special consideration. Understanding his appeal may help explain the lure of less polished practitioners. Moreover, his visibility on a national level makes him a factor to reckon with in our public life. Schuller has emerged as a national celebrity receiving press coverage in major periodicals and a solo appearance on the *Donahue* show, a widely syndicated television program. Clearly, since his prominence stems directly from his rhetorical skills, he is an appropriate figure for study. Finally, the popularity of his message indicates its force with the audience. The nature of that rhetorical appeal and its implications should provide insights into our national psyche.

Although Schuller's visibility and success make him an appropriate subject for analysis, his ministry has received no close scholarly scrutiny. Some commentators in the popular press have speculated on Schuller's appeal, tracing it to his personal charisma, his audience and environment, his showmanship, or his upbeat message.[16] These are all probably components of Schuller's appeal, but none explicates the rhetorical process underlying his effectiveness. The goal of this paper is to explore that rhetorical process in an attempt to answer Bockelman's first question. I will contend that Schuller's amalgamation of secular and spiritual values produces a rhetorically powerful version of American Civil Religion. This Civil Religion is especially appealing to affluent middle class Americans because Schuller's theology of self-esteem sanctifies self-interest and relieves the tension in his audience's minds between the demands of competitive private enterprise capitalism and Christian brotherhood. In essence, Schuller alleviates the tension between the material and spiritual "religions" which war for his audience's allegiances. Also, I will contend that Schuller's blending of the two sets of values is potentially harmful to many Americans because it equates spiritual virtue with occupational success. Furthermore, by removing the tension between religious and secular values, Schuller's gospel encourages a noncritical acceptance of traditional outlooks and removes the healthy dialectic between religion and other social institutions.

The essay falls into three parts: (1) a consideration of the relationship between the mythical American Dream of success and American Civil Religion; (2) an examination of Schuller's theology as it blends traditional protestantism and American capitalism; and (3) an analysis of the rhetorical implications of Schuller's version of American Civil Religion. The focus of this study is circumscribed in important ways. First, the analysis will treat only Schuller's verbal message. Although Schuller's mastery of the symbolic and of spectacle is evident in his broadcasts and in his Crystal Cathedral itself, those strategies will not be explored here. Second, the study will focus on the substance of Schuller's message rather than its style. Again, Schuller's skill with language is undeniable. The appeal of phrases like "Turn Your Scars Into Stars" and "Never Believe in Never" lies in their linguistic structure as well as in their substance. But such an analysis must wait for defter hands and keener ears. Moreover, the focus here is on the message itself and not the personality. Schuller's charisma and his personal intentions will not be examined.

The American Dream and American Civil Religion: The Development of a National Mythology

Because of our beginning as a land offering opportunity and religious freedom to immigrants, Americans have tended to idealize our national origins and character. We have regarded ourselves as a "chosen" nation

[15] Ben Armstrong, *The Electric Church* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1979).

[16] Cf. Singer, pp. 28–29; Barr, pp. 424–427; *Time*, 24 February 1975, pp. 38–39; *Newsweek*, 5 July 1971, pp. 51–52; Allman, pp. 7–9; Mariani, pp. 22–23, 25.

with a unique destiny. The Latin phrases on our one dollar bill suggest our view both of our distinctiveness ("Novus Ordo Seclorum": "A New Order for the Ages") and God's favor toward us ("Annuit Coeptis": "God has favored our undertaking").[17] This view came to constitute a public myth which provided both meaning and direction in our national life. As Christopher Mooney avers:

> A myth, in this sense, is that which declares man's relationship to the world of reality; it preserves a concrete human experience not by describing it so much as by transforming it, by giving insight into its meaning, so that it provides moral and spiritual motivation for individuals and society. As an empirical fact, the origin of the United States was the successful rebellion of thirteen colonies against England. But this event was immediately perceived in terms of a special destiny under God, an 'exodus' to a future in which America was chosen to demonstrate for all the world the possibilities for freedom and happiness in a constitutional republic.[18]

This myth not only provided a sense of national direction and meaning but it also provided a guide for individual activities. If America was the land of opportunity and freedom, then here individuals were free to realize their full potential. On a personal level the national myth engendered hopes and aspirations about life in this country, which have frequently been summarized with the epithet, "The American Dream." In his sharp critique of contemporary American life, Daniel Boorstin comments on this aspect of our culture: "America has been a land of dreams. A land where the aspirations of people from countries cluttered with rich, cumbersome, aristocratic, ideological pasts can reach for what once seemed unattainable. Here they have tried to make dreams come true. The American Dream was the most accurate way of describing the hopes of men in America."[19]

Although it has many complex ramifications, the American Dream, which inspires and guides many citizens, can be summarized in simple dramatic terms. The protagonist is a strong individualist, confident and optimistic. With hard work, perserverance, and competitiveness this individual can overcome barriers to achieve financial success and recognition. Irvin G. Wylie in his book *The Self-made Man in America: The Myth of Rags to Riches* comments, "The legendary hero of America is the self-made man . . . He represents our most cherished conceptions of success, and particularly our belief that any man can achieve fortune through the practice of industry, frugality, and sobriety." In tracing the course of this concept in American life, Wylie concludes "Its history is not the history of a great abstraction, but the saga of an idea that had power among the people."[20]

Although the self-made man has remained a constant ideal in our society, the concept of success itself has been complex and varied but has always embraced the notion that in this country a person of energy and initiative would inevitably achieve success through individual effort. John Cawelti in his study, *The Apostles of the Self-Made Man*, says that the self-made man has "persisted as a popular hero and as a central symbol of American society because Americans were able to synthesize, under his aegis, many conflicting strands of belief and aspiration."[21] *Newsweek's* 50th anniversary issue entitled *The American Dream*, which explores modern examples of this myth, indicates the viability of this concept today.

This American Dream is clearly reflected in the values which characterize our culture. Robin M. Williams, analyzing the common

[17] Donald B. Kraybill, *Our Star-Spangled Faith* (Scottdale, Penn.: Herald Press, 1976), p. 94.

[18] *Religion and the American Dream* (Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1977), p. 24. Cf. Robert N. Bellah, *The Broken Covenant* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), pp. 1–60; Charles L. Sanford, "An American 'Pilgrim's Progress'," *The American Culture*, ed. Hennig Cohen (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968), pp. 89–90.

[19] *The Image* (New York: Atheneum, 1975), pp. 239–240.

[20] (New York: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 6–7.

[21] *The Apostles of the Self-Made Man: Changing Concepts of Success in America* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 4.

values of our nation, writes "American culture is marked by a central stress upon personal achievement, especially secular occupational achievement. The 'success story' and the respect accorded to the self-made man are distinctly American, if anything is." Williams notes that American society is distinctive in its tendency to define personal excellence in terms of competitive occupational achievement.[22] If Williams is accurate in his assessment, the American Dream is not only a motivating force in our society, but it is also the epitome of our cultural values.

Will Herberg indicates the importance of the national myth about our destiny and its attendant American Dream in our lives by identifying them as the "operative religion" in our society. He argues that the "American Way of Life" provides an "overarching sense of unity" for the nation and is America's civil religion. "It is an organic structure of ideas, values, and beliefs that constitutes a faith common to Americans as Americans . . . in it national life is apotheosized, national values are religionized, national heroes are divinized, national history is experienced as a *Heilsgeschichte*, as a redemptive history."[23] Identifying the ethos of the American way of life as "dynamic, optimistic, pragmatic, individualistic, equalitarian, and pluralistic," Herberg says that such a civil religion is "the religionization of the national life and national culture."[24] Elsewhere Herberg argues that this civil religion has a pervasive, deep influence on all patterns of American thought and feeling, including the traditional denominations.[25]

Although Herberg's view of American Civil Religion is not the only interpretation of the concept, his analyses of its centrality in American life and its impact in our thought are significant.[26] He emphasizes the tremendous power of the American Dream and the myth of the self-made man in our lives. These concepts provide a rich mythical interpretation of American political and economic theories. As a secular mythology, they supply a justification and reaffirmation of many of our public and personal activities.

While the concept of the American Dream as a civil religion has focused on its secular features, its relationship to traditional religions has been problematic. The pursuit of worldly success, which is the essence of the American Dream, has not always been acceptable to theologians. Historically, theologians have perceived a tension between spiritual and worldly concerns, between the pursuit of Christian virtue, on the one hand, and financial success on the other. The question is simple: can a person serve two masters, God and Mammon? Max Weber argued that Protestantism, particularly the Calvinist tradition, permitted Christians to be concerned with accumulating wealth. Pointing to John Wesley's admonition that Christians should try "to gain all they can, and to save all they can; that is, in effect, to grow rich," Weber contended that Protestantism reinforced capitalistic enterprises.[27] Many have disagreed about the causal relationship Weber insisted existed between Protestantism and the rise of capitalism. But few would dispute that the Protestant ethic encouraged virtues which were consonant with and supportive of free enterprise capitalism. The pursuit of the Christian virtues of thrift and diligence would inevitably result in the accumulation of wealth. Financial success was an acceptable by-product of a religious life, but not its goal.

Starting from this assumed relationship between Christian virtue and financial success, modern evangelists have sometimes exploited the efficacy of religion as a tool to

[22] *American Society: A Sociological Interpretation*, 3rd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), pp. 454–498.

[23] "America's Civil Religion: What It Is and Whence It Comes," *American Civil Religion*, ed. Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), pp. 76–78.

[24] Ibid., pp. 79–80.

[25] Will Herberg, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew*, rev. ed. (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1960), pp. 88–89.

[26] Cf. *American Civil Religion*, pp. 14–18.

[27] *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism*, 2nd ed., trans. Talcott Parsons (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1976).

achieve worldly wealth.[28] Others have used religion as a basis for encouraging "positive thinking," which can in turn yield both internal and external rewards.[29] In essence, many denominations have diminished the traditional conflict between secular and spiritual concerns by acknowledging a causal connection between Christian faith and worldly success. God may be viewed as a source of power: "You can't lose with the stuff I use," urges the Reverend Ike. Less crassly, the deity can be seen as a benevolent father who wishes each person to be happy. In either case, worldly success is a concomitant to Christian virtue. The American Dream, thus, though secular in focus, is perceived as not necessarily antithetical to traditional religious concerns.

What exists in American culture, then, are two distinct but tangential hierarchies of value. The first, America's Civil Religion, places worldly success at its pinnacle. The American Dream provides a powerful mythology behind this civil religion both to inspire and reassure its adherents. The second, denominational religion, has salvation as its goal. It, too, has a powerful mythology behind it, perhaps best demonstrated in John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Within this myth Christians must struggle, resist temptation, and overcome sin to gain redemption. These two hierarchies encourage certain common virtues—diligence, thrift, perseverance. Moreover, although not congruent, they are not now usually necessarily perceived as antithetical.

However, points of conflict do occur. The excesses of capitalism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, culminating in the muckrakers' exposés, produced a strong period of conflict. More recently, dissidents in the sixties rejected the self-centeredness and competitiveness of private capitalism in favor of communal sharing and broad societal concerns. The tension between these hierarchies centers on the dichotomy between self-interest, which is the motivating force in capitalism, and responsibility for the welfare of others, which is a basic Christian duty. Persons pursuing the American Dream of success through private initiative may well experience some guilt at their neglect of the Biblical injunction to be their brother's keeper. What is needed to resolve this conflict is a religious rationalization and sanction for individualism. What Robert Schuller provides is precisely this: a Theology of Self-Esteem which sacralizes the American Dream.[30]

The Theology of Self-Esteem and Possibility Thinking: Sacralization of the American Dream

The cornerstone of Schuller's message is his "theology of self-esteem." Having explored the answers offered by philosophers, theologians, psychologists, and anthropologists about the nature of man, he concludes, "I suggest that to achieve self-esteem is the ultimate will of man—that what we really want more than anything else in the world is the awareness that we are worthy people . . . The human creature is unique in that he is a self-esteem seeking animal."[31] This will to self-esteem stems from our special role in God's plan of creation:

> So God placed man in charge of God's ordered creation, to rule, exercise dominion and be the great decision-making creature. Man was a supreme display incarnate! He was the star of God's creation. So the urge for greatness, the compulsion to create, the passion for excellence, the desire for recognition, the discontent with imperfection, the demand for personal freedom . . . even the desire to rule and dominate—all originate with our ancestral divine heritage when God made the human being to be great, glorious and perfectly proud.[32]

[28]Cf. William Wiethoff, "Rhetorical Enterprise in the Ministry of 'Reverend Ike'," *Communication Monographs*, 44 (1977), 52-59.

[29]Cf. Donald Meyer, *The Positive Thinkers: Religion as Pop Psychology from Mary Baker Eddy to Oral Roberts* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

[30]Cf. Hans J. Mol, *Identity and the Sacred* (New York: Free Press, 1976), pp. 1-16.

[31]"The Theology of Self-Esteem," *Saturday Evening Post*, May-June 1980, pp. 44, 88.

[32]Ibid., p. 88.

In essence, Schuller argues that the competitive urge and the drive toward self-assertion are God-given attributes. "All of us have ego-needs because we have royal blood. We are sons and daughters of God."[33] These God-given characteristics are precisely the qualities which motivate the self-made person in pursuit of the American Dream. The hero or heroine of the American myth, thus, is a personification of God's plan for humankind.

Calling his Theology of Self-Esteem an "unshakable foundation," Schuller outlines five facets of it, which reveal both its pragmatic tone and societal focus:

(1) A Theology of Communication: I have no right to insult, embarrass or violate any person's dignity by written or spoken word;
(2) A Theology of Evangelism: I have no right to offend the self-esteem of a person under the motivation or guise of 'saving his soul.' My evangelism must appeal to and respect his dignity as a person. I cannot manipulate or intimidate him into the Kingdom of God.
(3) A Theology of Social Ethics: Any act or deed becomes unethical if it lowers—however immeasureably—that invisible but all important mental climate in a community that I call "Society's collectivized Level of Self-Esteem." Do abortion and suicide make us more proud of ourselves as a human race? Or do they produce some embarrassment or shame?
(4) A Theology of Economics: How can we eradicate the real sin of poverty—which is the loss of dignity, the oppressed experience? By a handout? Or by an inspiring faith to discover and develop their God-given abilities through Possibility Thinking?
(5) A Theology of Government: It is no coincidence that the democratic system of government created in 1776 in the United States of America was inspired by the Calvinist theologians who held the dignity of man as the cornerstone of faith. Dictatorship violates freedom—which stifles my self-respect as a person![34]

These theologies clearly address one's social, political, and economic attitudes. Their focus is on an individual's behavior in this world; there is no mention of one's relationship to God in eternity. Together they describe the societal climate necessary for one to develop one's full potential. Implicit is the assumption that each person will flourish in a conducive climate, which must include freedom from economic, political, and emotional coercion. Schuller's theologies, therefore, are intimately related to American economic and political ideologies. As in the American Dream human beings are depicted as ambitious, optimistic, and energetic. Their goal of personal success can only be pursued in an environment free from restraints, a land of opportunity. A respect for individualism and a hearty endorsement for personal achievement permeate both Schuller's theology and the American Dream.

The role of God in Schuller's theology is as an inspiration and guide for individual activity. Self-esteem generates the motivation for success; God provides the direction through "possibility thinking." Humankind's nature is to seek self-esteem, but God's guidance is necessary to sanction and focus the quest. The bridge between the theology of self-esteem and the doctrine of possibility thinking is trust. Throughout his sermons Schuller reiterates emphatically the need to "Let Go and Let God." "Today I'm offering you a new way of living. It's held in these words, 'LET GO And LET GOD!' You can enjoy living, but not until you learn to let go and let God handle your life. It's these three areas of life that can get you down. First, the *stresses* of life. Then the *sins* of life. And finally the *successes* of life . . . LET GOD'S CARE HANDLE YOUR STRESS. LET GOD'S CROSS HANDLE YOUR SINS AND LET GOD'S CONTROL HANDLE YOUR SUCCESS."[35] In a series of three sermons on the "The Thrust of the Trust," Schuller argues that enjoyment of and success in life require trust in God and his plan for your life. Trust brings great power and unlocks an individual's potential; only with trust can an individual experience life fully.[36]

[33]Barr, p. 426.
[34]"Theology of Self-Esteem," pp. 88-89.
[35]"LET GO and LET GOD" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), pp. 7–8.
[36]Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.

Schuller reassures his listeners that God's plan for each life includes personal success: "God has a dream for your life. Become a possibility thinker and you will rise higher up the ladder and live a happier life."[37] Moreover, each life has a special God-given mission. In a Christmas sermon Schuller reaffirms the importance of each individual's role: "Every one of you without exception has something that you have to do—a special mission or task to perform in life—and nobody else can do it but you . . . I don't know what your calling from God is, but God has a plan for your life."[38] Elsewhere he urges, "*Never believe in Never*. God will give you the dream and with it the power."[39] The parallels between Schuller's view of God's plan for each life and the vision implicit in the American Dream are significant. While the American Dream asserts that the opportunity for success is available to all, Schuller's theology depicts it as an intrinsic element in the divine plan. Personal success is, then, not only a possibility open to all Americans, but also an individual manifest destiny. Capitalistic success is not simply an acceptable goal for the American Christians; it is also God's intention for them. Realizing the American Dream is achieving God's plan for one's life.

To pursue the American Dream and God's plan, believers are obligated to eliminate negative thinking, so that they can be open to God's inspiration and ready to follow their God-given creative instincts. Schuller devoted five Lenten sermons to the theme "Let's Eliminate Negative Thinking," which produces to the acronym LENT. Lent is a "positive church," Schuller asserts, is "a time for creative self-denial—eliminating negative thinking . . . The cross isn't a negative symbol—it's a positive symbol. It's a plus sign. Jesus taught us how to turn a minus into a plus. Jesus was the world's greatest possibility thinker."[40] Schuller's radical reinterpretation of the Lenten season is emblematic of his adaptation of Christian concepts. Traditionally a penitential season, Lent encouraged self-denial so that a believer could turn from worldly to spiritual concerns. Consciousness of one's sinfulness and spiritual limitations was integral to this process. In Schuller's reinterpretation, one is encouraged to turn from abnegation and self-accusal to self-affirmation. The penitential turning *from* the world to concentrate on spiritual matters becomes a celebratory *seeking out* of worldly possibilities. This pursuit of secular opportunities is, of course, one avenue for achieving the American Dream.

Schuller provides clear guidelines for practicing the possibility thinking which is essential for success. Averring that "God's solutions are always ideas," Schuller contends, "The best thing God can give you is not a check, but creative thinking . . . God's whole system of economics is so simple. At the bottom line it is possibility thinking."[41] To help believers cope with the inspiration God will provide, Schuller offers "Ten Commandment for Possibility Thinking":

1. Never reject a possibility because you see something wrong with it!
2. Never reject a possibility because you won't get credit!
3. Never reject an idea because it's impossible!
4. Never reject a possibility because your mind is already made up!
5. Never reject an idea because it's illegal!
6. Never reject an idea because you don't have the money, manpower, muscle, or months to achieve it!
7. Never reject an idea because it will create conflict!
8. Never reject an idea because it's not your way of doing things!
9. Never reject an idea because it might fail!
10. Never reject an idea because it's sure to succeed![42]

Adopting these attitudes is the first step toward becoming a possiblity thinker.

The second step involves action. In a ser-

[37]"Someday is Today, Part 3" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), p. 5.
[38]"Direction with Affection" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), pp. 5–6.
[39]"Never Believe in Never, Part II" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), p. 12.
[40]"Let's Eliminate Negative Thinking, Part 2" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), p. 3.
[41]*Ibid.*, Part 1, pp. 8–9.
[42]*Ibid.*, Part 2, p. 7.

mon appropriately entitled "Strive to Arrive," Schuller list three types of people (doers, viewers, sleepers) and exhorts his listeners to be people who make things happen.[43] Other sermons encourage listeners to "sight," "write," "fight" for, and "light" their goal and not to "vegetate, procrastinate, luxuricate or negativate."[44] The dynamism and energy which Schuller urges here are characteristics essential to the self-made person in the American Dream. Moreover, Schuller's focus in possibility thinking is on occupational success which is the self-made person's goal. One sermon delineates the five phases of an idea—"nesting," "testing," "investing," "arresting" and "cresting."[45] Schuller's supporting examples reinforce his concern with material accomplishments. Stories of corporate executives, rags-to-riches success stories, historical examples, and abundant references to his own phenomenal success in building his Crystal Cathedral make clear his orientation.[46]

In "Strive to Come Alive, Part 2," Schuller rationalizes his focus:

> Why should a person strive for success? Isn't that a pretty selfish objective? No, for when we succeed, whether it's in school, marriage, business or social services—we inspire others to try to win, too . . . *We have a stewardship to attempt to succeed for the glory of God and for the inspiration of others!* Success is not a selfish objective, for there is no way you can succeed unless you find a need and fill it, find a hurt and heal it, find a problem and solve it! . . . Success is *being the person God wants you to be.*[47]

Schuller's condoning of personal achievement in such secular areas as business, school, and social services reinforces the individualism which underlies the American Dream. The striving for personal distinction in worldly affairs is not only a realization of God's plan for one's life, it also produces the opportunity to be of service to others. Refuting those who claim that striving for success is egotistical, Schuller responds, "To choose poverty instead of prosperity, failure instead of success, low achievement instead of top of the ladder achievement simply for the sake of being humble is not super-Christian. It's dumb. Only successful people can help people who are failing. *Only winners will survive to give food to the hungry.*"[48] Becoming a "winner," thus, opens avenues for one to be a benefactor to others. Success, acceptable in its own right, is also an antecedent to social responsibility.

Schuller's encouragement of success encompasses the strong work ethic characteristic of the American Dream. While he does not argue that good works are necessary for salvation, he stresses the need for the audience to pursue actively and energetically their God-given goals. The titles of his sermons reflect this tenet: "Strive to Come Alive," "Strive to Arrive," "Arrive then Survive," and "Someday is Today!" In each he admonishes his audience to begin the pursuit of their goals and to take risks. Arguing that too many people are content with risk-free lives, Schuller asserts bluntly, "It takes guts to leave the ruts!"[49] This emphasis on initiative and energy reflect the qualities necessary for the self-made person's success. Schuller's message reaffirms the American adage that success is 99% perspiration and 1% inspiration.

Schuller acknowledges that barriers exist and obstacles develop, but these cannot excuse believers from continuing to struggle. "Turn Your Scars Into Stars" is the title of an article in *Saturday Evening Post* which suggests "out of weakness can come strength, out of brokenness can come a new beauty and wholeness."[50] This theme is fully developed in a sermon which outlines the problems and

[43]Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d., p. 4.

[44]"Arrive then Survive," "Someday is Today" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.).

[45]"The Leaf with a Lift" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), pp. 7–12.

[46]"The Leaf with a Lift," "Arrive then Survive," and "Strive to Come Alive."

[47]Part 2 (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), pp. 3, 11.

[48]"Let's Eliminate Negative Thinking, Part 2," p. 10.

[49]Ibid, Part 2, p. 4; "LET GO and LET GOD," p. 5.

[50]*Saturday Evening Post*, April 1978, p. 58.

obstacles confronting Christ and how he overcame them. Schuller contends "Jesus showed us we are not victims of our circumstances! . . . Jesus Christ is the ultimate possibility thinker and today he's telling you that your dreams can rise from the dead, too. Your hopes can rise from the ashes."[51] The perseverance Schuller urges and his minimization of the impact of circumstances reinforce traditional American views. He reiterates the bromide, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again," adding the assurance that one will finally triumph. Indeed, Schuller implies that each individual's version of the American Dream will come true in the land of opportunity under God's guidance.

The contrasts between Schuller's analyses and traditional views of human nature and existence are clear. Schuller's gospel replaces the traditional picture of a Christian struggling against the temptations of the world, sinning, seeking forgiveness and relief from guilt, with the "new seeker" struggling with a negative self-image, striving to realize God-given potential and to make the success of life which God intends. The traditional Christian views the world as a mixture of natural beauty and spiritual trial; the new seeker regards it as as a place of possibilities for success. The traditional Christian seeks mastery of personal frailties and imperfections through grace; the new seeker strives to practice possibility thinking with God's inspiration. In Schuller's gospel the realization of the American Dream becomes the sacred mission of each person. Individualism and the pursuit of capitalistic success are sacralized as quintessential Christian characteristics.

Rhetorical Implications

To understand the rhetorical impact of Schuller's message one must view it both in terms of the audience he intends to reach and in light of its broader societal ramifications. Schuller's target audience is clear: "It's obvious we are not trying impress Christians. . . . They would tend to be most critical of the expenditure of money we have made. They would tell us we should give this money to missions. . . . We're trying to impress non-Christians and non-churched people. We are trying to make a big, beautiful impression upon the affluent non-religious American who is riding by on this busy freeway."[52] In *Newsweek* of July 5, 1971, Schuller avers, "We are in the retail business. . . . The neighborhood church violates the basic principle of retailing because it can't fully serve its customers." As the article correctly concludes: "Schuller concentrates above all on reinforcing the ingrained social instincts of his parishioners, most of whom are tied far more closely to their communities and the economy than to any religion."[53]

Such an audience presents a substantial rhetorical challenge because its loyalties are often split. Theologian J. Earl Thompson, Jr., hints at the conflict between sectarian theologies and what he terms the "religion of the Republic," which "embodies and cherishes the ideals, aspirations, and hopes that have been traditionally associated with America." He notes: "A persistent, powerful religion of the Republic presents a formidable challenge to the administrative, intellectual and spiritual leaders of the denominations. They have to deal with a sizable proportion of their constituency whose religious loyalties are divided, often equally, between commitments to the religion of the Republic and to their sect, and they have to reach a large number of people who are increasingly unresponsive to sectarian claims."[54]

Schuller's message, which is consciously directed toward the non-religious group

[51]"The Greatest Possibility Thinker That Ever Lived" (Garden Grove, Calif.: Crystal Cathedral Ministries, n.d.), pp. 9–10.

[52]Quoted in Bockelman, p. 733.

[53]P. 51.

[54]"The Reform of the Racist Religion of the Republic," in *The Religion of the Republic*, ed. Elwyn A. Smith (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 267–68.

Thompson describes, is very compelling to this audience for two reasons: (1) his sanctification of economic activities provides a sense of destiny and meaning in his followers' lives, and (2) his concept of service permits his followers to avoid involvement in the controversial issues which often plague traditional religious groups.

First, Schuller's adroit mixing of self-reliance with divine guidance produces a personal manifest destiny for each listener. Although Schuller counsels his followers to be risk takers, he simultaneously assures them of God's plan for and interest in their successes. Rather than being adventurers into an unknown land with an uncertain future, Schuller's followers are warranted against failure because they are pursuing God's plan for their lives. This line of reasoning not only provides purpose and meaning for one's business life but also suffuses that facet of life with a religious glow. Achieving success is fulfilling one's God-given manifesto. Although this transmorgification may open Schuller to charges of "selling indulgences," it provides members a sense of purpose and meaning in their business lives. Edward O. Wilson highlights this function of religious thinking: "The highest forms of religious practice . . . above all . . . congeal identity. In the midst of the chaotic and potentially disorienting experiences each person undergoes daily, religion classifies him, provides him with unquestioned membership in a group claiming great power, and by this means gives him a driving purpose in his life compatible with self-interest. His strength is the strength of the group, his guide the sacred covenant. The theologian and sociologist Hans J. Mol has aptly termed this key process the 'sacralization of identity.' "[55]

While Wilson traces the roots of this process to human biology and argues that such thinking confers a distinct advantage in evolution, Joseph Campbell less controversially identifies it as a key function of myth in society. Campbell argues that myths help shape "individuals to the aims and ideas of their various social groups, bearing them from birth to death through the course of a human life."[56] Schuller's theological depiction of human nature and existence reinforces the mythology inherent in the American Dream. More explicitly, Schuller describes ambition and drive as God-given attributes. These attributes are, of course, key characteristics of the hero in the American myth. Schuller suggests that worldly success is part of God's plan for each life. Such success is the goal and inevitable reward of those who pursue the American Dream. The striving, competitiveness, and individualism which are essential features of the American Dream are viewed as a part of God's gift to humankind in Schuller's theology. Schuller skillfully incorporates the essence of the American Dream mythology into his theological explanation of human nature. The American Dream becomes an incarnation of humankind's spiritual nature which God has ordained and sanctified. He adds the authentication of religion to a societal myth which his audience has already embraced. By "sacrilizing" his audience's business activities, Schuller helps them find new meaning and purpose in their lives.

In addition to providing a sense of meaning in his audience's lives, Schuller reinforces many elements of his targeted audiences' self-concepts and reaffirms many of their existing commitments. He effectively reduces the inherent tension between capitalistic self-interest and Christian theology by refocusing and reinterpreting key concepts. He spiritualizes American private enterprise and provides a religious sanction for and rationalization of competitive capitalism. By assuring his audience that God wants them to be successful so they can be helpful to others, Schuller provides a blessing for busi-

[55] *On Human Nature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 188.

[56] "Mythological Themes in Creative Literature and Art," *Myths, Dreams, and Religion*, ed. Joseph Campbell (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1970), p. 141.

ness activities. Following a business career is united with religious pursuits so that success in the first evinces and reinforces commitment to the second. Schuller makes achievement of the American Dream fulfillment of a religious crusade. The perfect Christian is simultaneously an American hero.

Moreover, Schuller's call to service is within an established social order. His followers are not called upon to make adjustments in the societal framework but to work within it to ameliorate personal problems. Again Schuller's fusion of economics and religion is significant. He does not fault the existing order, as many mainline religious groups have done on such issues as abortion and civil rights. Rather, he urges support of it through charity within it. To people who have been the beneficiaries of the exisitng order Schuller's message is both palatable and comfortable. In this respect, Schuller's myth fulfills another key function identified by Campbell. Campbell argues that myths have always been involved in "validating and maintaining some specific social order, authorizing its moral code as a construct beyond criticism or human emendation."[57] Schuller's message of self-esteem and possibility thinking reinforce and, indeed, sanctify the existing order. By emphasizing the limitless potential in the existing economic system, Schuller encourages his followers to look for opportunities within that structure. Moreover, his Theology of Economics and Government explicitly endorses private enterprise capitalism as it exists in this country. The political and economic ideologies governing American thinking are not just given factors in Schuller's schema, they are desiderata. Schuller reiterates that the American system is the ideal. The United States is the new Eden, envisioned in the most romantic versions of the American Dream.

Here, Schuller's rhetorical force is also undoubtedly augmented by the timing of his message. Schuller began his television ministry in the early 1970's at a time when American institutions, especially American business, had been under severe attack. Moreover, his local audience was identified by one source as "the tides of technicians attracted by Orange County's booming electronics and aerospace industries."[58] This immediate group, and by 1970 most of middle America, had been assailed by attacks on the American values and institutions to which they were firmly committed. Schuller, in contrast to many activist religious leaders, comfortingly reinforced the capitalistic hierarchy which had been under attack. Moreover, his careful, deliberate avoidance of the controversial issues which sometimes polarized the country made his message a refreshing and appealing alternative to the more strident voices of other groups. Indeed, Schuller avers that preaching on such issues would undercut his influence and would violate his theology of self-esteem by insulting the dignity of his media audience.[59] His followers can, if they wish, rationalize their own noninvolvement by appealing to Schuller's example and message. Schuller articulated this defense in his appearance on the *Donahue* show: "The secret of success is to build a power base, and then use that power to generate income or other spiritual, psychological, emotional or financial resources to help the people who are really down." Followers can avoid embroilment in controversy on public commitment (or opposition) to social reformers by referencing their efforts to construct the necessary power base. They are relieved, therefore, of the need to examine their activities in the light of larger social issues.

An adaptation of Kenneth Burke's concept of hierarchy and guilt may clarify the impact of Schuller's message in this respect. If rejection of a hierarchy entails guilt, continued allegiance to an order under attack may produce some discomfort and self-doubt. As

[57]Campbell, p. 140.

[58]"Spiritual Shopping Center," *Newsweek*, 5 July 1971, p. 51.

[59]Eockelman, p. 733; *Donahue;* T. D. Allman, "Jesus in Tomorrow Land," *The New Republic*, 27 November 1976, p. 8; Mariani, p. 25.

Burke expresses it, "An increasing number who still share some material advantages from the ailing economic structure become spiritually alienated as they lose faith in the structure's 'reasonableness.' "[60] Schuller's message, in offering an elaborated religious sanction for the economic hierarchy, a sanction based on "God's plan for mankind in his creation," reaffirms the "reasonableness" of the questioned order. Moreover, his insistence that success entails a responsibility to be of service to others provides a means of expiating whatever guilt remains through self-sacrifice. In essence, Schuller sanctifies self-interest by tying it to the divine order and by offering service as an antidote to greed. He reaffirms the questioned order and provides a simple means of expiation. Happily for believers, the means of expiation itself provides a boost to their ego because they become public benefactors as well as models of Christian economic success.

In short, what Schuller offers is a powerful version of American Civil Religion as Will Herberg conceived it. His theology of self-esteem and his gospel of possibility thinking reinforce many of the values of private enterprise capitalism. The optimism, pragmaticism, and individualism which are part of the ethos of American Civil Religion, in Herberg's view, are the very virtues essential for the possibility thinker. Schuller's rhetorical force derives from his drawing on the emotional reservoirs of both American myth and religious doctrine. The result is a pattern of life where religious beliefs coincide with and reinforce professional allegiances. The grafting of Christian theology onto the rootstock of the American Dream creates a powerful rhetoric for the intended audience. The Possibility Thinker becomes the epitome of both Christian ideals and American values. Although Schuller's message may be "a spiritual tranquilizer," it is certainly the "right kind of pudding" for those to whom he calls "Come in here, there's something good inside for you."

Although Schuller's blending of American private enterprise and Christian theology seemingly satisfies the appetite of his targeted audience, the quality of that "pudding" deserves closer scrutiny, for sating of public tastes may not be a sign of nutritional value. But the risk of labelling "unhealthy" a substance that is personally unsavory dictates great care in selecting criteria for assessment. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell in her analysis of Nixon's Vietnamization address encourages critics to let the work itself suggests appropriate standards.[61] Schuller's "Theology of Self-Esteem" provides the key criterion: Does his message promote healthy self-esteem in his listeners?

Although Schuller vaguely and innocuously defines "success" as being the person God wants one to be, the thrust and substance of his message equate success with accomplishment, achievement, and advancement in personal and professional affairs. Schuller's formula for success involves only two factors, the individual and God, with situations and circumstances being viewed as only minor, temporary barriers for the Possibility Thinker. This definition and approach to success blur the distinction between spiritual development and secular accomplishment. Not only are the two often synonymous in Schuller's theology, but the presence of success seems to indicate spiritual worthiness. For example, in one passage Schuller thanks God for Possibility Thinkers whom he labels "*dedicated* dreamers . . . *sanctified* opportunitists . . . *glorified* gamblers . . . powerful believers" and whose "monuments" are "successful marriages and happy families, profitable businesses, and great institutions, lifesaving drugs and surgical procedures, skyscrapers . . . satellites . . . laughing children."[62]

[60] "Twelve Propositions on the Relation between Economics and Psychology," *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1973), p. 306.

[61] Karyln Kohrs Campbell, "An Exercise in the Rhetoric of Mythical America," *Critiques of Contemporary Rhetoric* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1972), p. 50.

[62] *Move Ahead with Possibility Thinking*, p. 16. Italics mine to reinforce Schuller's sanctification process discussed earlier.

This blurring of spirituality with secular achievement produces four consequences on a personal level. First, Schuller's theology does not differentiate between kinds and types of accomplishment. Presumably any successful activity becomes a badge of religious merit. Although Schuller would undoubtedly not condone corrupt practices, his theology offers no way to assess relative merit. Hubert Humphrey, John Wayne, and the founder of Mary Kay Cosmetics receive equal billing for their accomplishments. Norman Cousins, the redoubtable former editor of *Saturday Review*, is commended for his overcoming of a serious medical problem through positive thinking rather than for his contributions to American intellectual, literary, and political life. What emerges is a kind of boosterism, devoid of appropriate value judgments.

Such an approach can yield what Martin E. Marty terms "cheap grace." As Marty observes: "In the adult world the successful religious organizations are advertised for the success they produce. The moral pattern they develop sanctions the approved standards of the community but allows for hypocrisy. The moral preachment there rarely attacks the kind of ethical flaws built into their system; executive cheating or rounding corners on income tax would seldom be mentioned. Instead, the people are congratulated for the way they lifted themselves by their bootstraps and won Brownie points."[63] In essence, using success as evidenced by achievement as the criterion for spiritual worthiness may falsely value many accomplishments and severely undervalue others.

Second, unsuccessful people may come to be viewed by themselves and others as "unworthy" persons. The pursuit of financial success is an indication that one is following God's plan as Weber argued it was for Calvinists and a means of doing God's work. Success in capitalistic enterprises becomes a mark of faith, piety, and charity; success becomes "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." If success is a badge of God's approval and the application of possibility thinking, failure implies pessimism, lack of religious faith, or even defiance of God's plan. In any case, the less successful person can blame only him or herself since Schuller's theology assures us that circumstances are not real impediments to success. The results of this attitude are guilt, bewilderment, and frustration for the less successful person.

A third difficulty with Schuller's version of American Civil Religion is its perhaps unintentional reinforcement of socio-economic class lines and questionable values. For example, three of Schuller's ten tips for boosting one's spirits to promote self-love are inaccessible to the underprivileged: "Join a status-building club that commands respect in your community.... Buy some new clothes.... Get to know some important person."[64] In another book he suggests borrowing money to finance a creative project: "Responsible debt is a badge of belief."[65] While such activities are clearly not immoral, they say little about spiritual concerns and offer little psychological or religious help to the underprivileged. Schuller's theology reinforces the activities of the successful listener, but provides little direction for less affluent.

Although his urging of private philanthropy and concern for the less fortunate are appropriate, his notion that "the real sin of poverty.... is a loss of dignity" which cannot be remedied by "a handout" is not only a simplistic analysis, but an unfortunate one as well for it seems to undercut social welfare programs indiscriminately. While few feel these programs are the optimum answers to the complex problems they address, most would agree that many are often appropriate and constructive activities. To label them as "handouts" must certainly embarrass and

[63]Marty E. Martin, *The Pro and Con Book of Religious America* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1975), "Con," p. 107.

[64]*Self Love: The Dynamic Force of Success*, p. 101.
[65]*Move Ahead with Possibility Thinking*, p. 105.

demean those who are legitimately dependent on these programs. For example, Schuller declares, "You have no right to expect the state to take care of you. Here is a major signpost on God's way to good living: The unhappy man is the one who is not working. The unemployed, the forcibly retired, the physically handicapped have a constant battle against boredom, monotony, and that feeling of usefulness. . . . Are you unhappy? How long has it been since you have done a good day's work?"[66]

Although Schuller's intention is "positive," the force and implication of his rhetoric may well undercut the self-respect of those dependent on governmental aid. Furthermore, Schuller's implication that what the poor need are role models of successful entrepreneurs or faith in possibility thinking seems smug and insensitive. Schuller's error is to design a theology for the middle class and then assert its generalizability to all. Schuller's analysis also overlooks the role of institutions in limiting human accomplishment and the necessity sometimes to modify institutions. By emphasizing the desirability of individual initiative, Schuller neglects the need for constraints on some persons and institutions. His optimistic assessment of individual generosity, concern, and ability causes him to forget real socio-economic and personal limitations on individual achievement.

Again, Kenneth Burke's concept of hierarchy and guilt may help clarify the impact of Schuller's message. By reaffirming the existing order, Schuller may intensify the sense of alienation and guilt felt by people who have not shared in the benefits of the system. His assertion that the order is founded in a divine plan indicates that their difficulties are of their own making and are the result of their own inadequacies. Perhaps unwittingly, he increases the spiritual alienation they may experience in conjunction with their material alienation. Since Schuller minimizes the influence of situations on personal success, failure becomes a mark of personal limitation. One can only blame one's self. If individuals fail to live out the American Dream, they may experience a strong sense of guilt: they have not measured up either to God's plan or to our national myth. They are alienated spiritually and economically from American society. Ironically, the only way to expiate this guilt and reduce this spiritual alienation is to practice possibility thinking. But it is a failure to do this very thing which has produced the initial failures.

Fourth, Schuller's message may create unrealistic expectations in the hearer. While no one will doubt the crucial role of motivation in success, most of us also recognize real differences in human potential. Schuller's message takes little note of such differences as it suggests that each person excels in some realm. While diminishing of the obstacles imposed by environment or institutions may be healthy in many respects, a philosophy that insists anyone can excel may produce further frustration, bewilderment, and guilt in those who fail in their endeavors.

Schuller's sanctioning of competitiveness may also have unhealthy societal repercussions. Success is often difficult to measure in many occupations: Is a good surgeon the one performing the most operations? Does an improved sculptor simply sell more pieces this year than last? Does a good preacher increase his congregation each year? This approach may lead to quantification as a measure of personal improvement.

On a societal level Schuller's message presents several other problems. While one can appreciate this concern for individual dignity, the notion that one should not violate another's dignity by spoken or written word is questionable. In cases of injustice or abuse perpetrated by individuals or institutions, insults of "dignity" are not only appropriate but at times morally mandatory. Again, in Schuller's ideal state, persons of good conscience would not be unjust. Human nature, however, often fails to be ideal. The questions of justice and equity seem more signifi-

[66] *God's Way to the Good Life* (New Canaan, Conn.: Keats, 1974), p. 103.

cant than preservation of self-esteem. Here, too, Schuller's philosophy seems a rationalization for avoiding societal controversies. Indeed, Schuller himself excuses his avoidance of social issues: "But I am *not* an evangelist. . . . People say I don't preach enough about social problems. But if we are to use the media, we must respect the individual's dignity. I can't insult my audience. With my local parishioners I can exhort them to social action, but I must *broad*cast, not *narrow*cast, on television."[67] Such broadcasting makes his message more widely palatable, but severely limits its socially constructive possibilities.

Finally, Schuller's religion endorsement of American economic values dissolves the healthy dialectic between the religious realm and other social institutions. By urging correspondence between religious and secular concerns, Schuller's gospel diminishes the church's role as the critic and conscience of society. Urging his followers to work within the established framework not only endorses the existing arrangement but also discourages constructive criticism and amelioration of institutionalized injustices. While some denominations have encouraged followers to seek changes in the social order because of their allegiance to higher values, Schuller's message touts the advantages and opportunities in the present system. Followers need not engage in painful introspection about themselves or society. Indeed, such thoughts would be "negative thinking." As a result, Schuller's gospel provides little opportunity for religious values to enhance public life. In this respect, Schuller's message is strikingly different from other evangelists who do criticize and attempt to alter American society. Implicitly and explicitly, Schuller's gospel encourages societal self-congratulation and Pollyannish optimism. If American society can benefit from a more positive, less destructive view of itself, the healthiest alternative is not a non-critical, smug acceptance of the status quo. America is perhaps best served by denominations which hold persons accountable in the light of their respective values. We need not accept or agree with all such criticism, but the exchange of ideas and conflict of values enriches and enlivens our national life. Schuller's gospel provides no bone of contention and little stimulation.

What then can we conclude about Schuller's message? Does it, as it claims, stimulate healthy self-esteem in the audiences? For those who are already affluent Americans and those who have easy access to advancement, Schuller's message probably spurs hard work and achievement. By reaffirming their commitments, it may provide a stimulus to further accomplishment and encourage a sense of challenges mastered, responsibilities fulfilled, and work rewarded. But it can also promote smugness and self-congratulation. Its blending of success and spirituality may promote unmerited reinforcement for activities that do little for the larger group. Moreover, its repercussions with the unsuccessful or those constrained by circumstances may be devastating. It provides little help for those people and may stimulate unwarranted guilt or unreasonable frustration. Schuller's message substitutes the theoretical *possibility* of the American Dream for each person with its ethical *inevitability*. By so doing, it generates a false criterion for measuring individual worth. Schuller's message is, indeed, well designed for affluent Americans. But it offers little sustenance for the less affluent. These problems are inherent in any gospel which provides a full religious endorsement of social and political values. Religious advocates of possibility thinking in any of its forms offer little help in constructive efforts to improve our national institutions. The self-esteem they encourage in their followers promotes self congratulation for accomplishments rather than thoughtful analyses of merit. For those of us already reaping the benefits of life in this country, Schuller's message provides the icing of self-esteem for our cakes. For others, it provides only bitter bread.

[67]Mariani, p. 25.

JOHN LENNON AND THE ADVISORY FUNCTION OF EULOGIES

Karen A. Foss

"Everybody loves you when you're six feet in the ground."[1]

—John Lennon

Eulogies as a rhetorical genre have been studied since Aristotle pointed to the eulogy as a major category of epideictic discourse.[2] Contemporary treatments of the genre have focused primarily on the situational and stylistic features of eulogies—i.e., to what exigencies did the eulogist respond, and what stylistic forms did his or her praise assume? Carpenter and Seltzer, for example, studied four eulogies delivered in the United States Capitol to determine stylistic features emerging from this common content.[3] Similarly, Brownlow and Davis examined and evaluated the appropriateness of Adlai Stevenson's eulogies as responses to the rhetorical situations created by the deaths of four national leaders.[4]

Eulogies generally are assumed to serve four basic functions: (1) to make real the death to the shocked audience; (2) to lessen personal fears of mortality with the descriptions of how the deceased "lives on"; (3) to allow the audience to reorient themselves to the deceased; and (4) to reassure the audience that the community will continue despite the death.[5] Yet a fifth function well might be added to the list—to advise. Aristotle recognized that eulogies contain a deliberative or exhortative component, since praise can be phrased in such a way as to assume the force of suggestion: "When you wish to praise, consider what you would suggest as advisable; and when you wish to advise, consider what you would praise a man for doing."[6]

Dorgan, in his study of Gerald Smith's funeral oration for Huey P. Long, touches on the advisory function; he points out that it was an epideictic oration that assumed much of the nature of a deliberative address.[7] Dorgan seemed to consider this dual purpose unusual in eulogies, however, and does not explore the role of advising as a vital function perhaps inherent to the eulogistic genre. Berens indirectly acknowledges an advisory function as well in his study of the eulogies given upon George Washington's death. He shows how the eulogies made use of a prophecy about the first President to promote American nationalism.[8] In contrast, Carpenter and Seltzer directly recognize the potential for advice-giving in eulogies when they write: "Of course a eulogy also may use praise, as Aristotle suggested, as a basis for inspiring an audience to some future virtue

Karen A. Foss is Associate Professor of Speech Communication at Humboldt State University. *An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, February 1982.*

[1]John Lennon, "Nobody Loves You When You're Down and Out," *Walls and Bridges*, 1974.

[2]Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1368a.

[3]Ronald H. Carpenter and Robert V. Seltzer, "Situational Style and the Rotunda Eulogies," *Central States Speech Journal*, 22 (Spring 1971), 11–15.

[4]Paul C. Brownlow and Beth Davis, " 'A Certainty of Honor': The Eulogies of Adlai Stevenson," *Central States Speech Journal*, 25 (Fall 1974), 217–24.

[5]Kathleen M. Jamieson, *Critical Analogy of Public Speeches* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1978), pp. 40–41.

[6]Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1358a.

[7]Howard Dorgan, "Gerald L. K. Smith and the Huey P. Long Funeral Oration," *Southern Speech Journal*, 36 (Summer 1971), 378–89.

[8]John F. Berens, " 'Like a Prophetic Spirit': Samuel Davies, American Eulogists, and the Deification of George Washington," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 63 (October 1977), 290–97.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 34 (Fall 1983), 187–194

on their part." They go no further than acknowledgement, however, and seem to consider the advisory function as obvious and of secondary importance to the stylistic and situational manifestations of praise: "That moral or application [future virtue or action] for the audience likely will require little or no demonstration as to its suitability for that occasion, though, and the eulogist still can concern himself primarily with his style."[9] The advisory function of eulogies, then, only has been touched on in studies of the genre to date.

This essay is intended as an initial exploration of the advisory function inherent in the genre of eulogies. As a case in point, I have chosen to examine the discourse that followed the death of John Lennon. A songwriter, singer, and former member of the singing group, the Beatles, Lennon was shot and killed by Mark David Chapman on December 8, 1980, as he and his wife returned to their Dakota apartment in New York City.[10]

Because Lennon was a popular cultural hero, rather than a public official, his death generated primarily informal discourse, in contrast to the formal addresses of praise delivered at funerals or memorial services that typically follow the deaths of national leaders. Lennon's death, then, also provides the opportunity to make use of what I shall call "eulogistic discourse," or those less traditional, often informal and ephemeral, forms of tribute that serve a eulogistic function. These may consist of newspaper and magazine articles, newspaper editorials, television and radio tributes, songs, and even bumper stickers.[11] My contention in the remainder of this essay is that the eulogistic discourse that marked Lennon's death served an important advisory function for his fans.

I do not intend to generalize from the discourse surrounding John Lennon's death to the eulogistic genre in general.[12] Rather, this analysis is intended as one possible way of examining a previously neglected dimension of the eulogistic genre. Similar examinations of other bodies of eulogistic literature will be necessary before generalization about the genre as a whole are warranted.

A Hierarchy of Identification

In order to understand how the eulogies offered after Lennon's death functioned to advise his fans, an understanding of the relationship that existed between Lennon and his fans during his life is necessary. The recounting of the life and deeds of the deceased is standard eulogy fare; thus, the description of this relationship was woven throughout the eulogistic discourse and was easily compiled from them.

Before proceeding, however, important to point out is that there is no "typical" Lennon fan. There always are degrees of attraction to and adulation for superstars, and Lennon's fans were no exception. Some fans identified primarily with his music, while others admired his lifestyle and forthrightness. Despite this diversity, the tributes and praise expressed by fans in the aftermath of the shooting showed a common thread of respect for Lennon and and sense of personal loss at

[9]Carpenter and Seltzer, "Situational Style," p. 12.

[10]"John Lennon of Beatles is Killed; Suspect Held in Shooting at Dakota," *New York Times*, December 9, 1980, p. A1. Mark David Chapman pleaded guilty to second-degree murder for the shooting of Lennon and on August 24, 1981, he was sentenced to twenty-years-to-life in prison. See "Chapman Shifts Plea to Guilty in Lennon Death," *Washington Post*, June 23, 1981, p. A1; and " 'Catcher in the Rye' in His Hand, Killer of Lennon is Sentenced," *Washington Post*, August 25, 1981, p. A2.

[11]For this study I collected as much of the discourse that emerged following the shooting of Lennon as I could, including newspaper and magazine tributes, letters to the editor and newspaper editorials, specials of Lennon's music aired on radio, and even bumper stickers. Although I did not come close to collecting everything available nationwide that could be termed eulogistic discourse, my data, at the least, is a representative sample. It included everything published in two major national newspapers—the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* as well as samples from other newspapers such as *The Denver Post* and my local paper, *The Eureka Times-Standard*. Articles in national magazines—i.e., *Newsweek, Time, Rolling Stone, People*, etc.—also were obtained, as were some special booklets compiled about him. In addition, I listened to several radio tributes and attended to remarks about Lennon made in conversation by people after the shooting.

[12]While Lennon has much in common with other public figures assassinated in the past two decades, he also is an exception of sorts. He was a musician, for example, while most were elected public officials or candidates for office. Perhaps he was most similar to Martin Luther King, Jr. in that both sought to achieve social change.

his death. The shooting, in a sense, minimized differences among fans, and the attitudes shared by all dominated the eulogistic discourse.

The relationship between Lennon and his fans profitably may be viewed within the framework of a hierarchy. According to Burke, hierarchies—levels of privilege, status, and distinction—are inevitable in human societies because of the human tendency to move toward or be "goaded" by order.[13] We continually strive to reach and seek to know those at other levels of the hierarchy. Because we cannot know them completely, however, an element of mystery exists for us about them.[14] More important, those at the top of the hierarchy—those most different from and mysterious to us—come to be seen as perfect or absolute manifestations of our ideals. By means of communication, we strive to identify with those above us, addressing or courting them in hopes of achieving the total identification we desire. Because of the imperfections of our language, however, perfect communication up the hierarchy or pure identification with our ideals never can be attained.

In the relationship between Lennon and his fans, the nature of the hierarchy as Burke describes it functioned true to form. A hierarchy consisting of three levels characterized the relationship of Lennon and his fans and was apparent in the discourse following Lennon's death. The foundation of their relationship was Lennon as Beatle, since this was the basis of Lennon's renown. At the next rung in the hierarchy was Lennon's personal self, of which his fans did not really become aware until after the break-up of the Beatles. The ideal at the top of the hierarchy, or the highest level, was peace and truth for society as a whole. A more detailed description of each of these levels or points of identification will clarify Lennon's relationship with his fans.

[13]Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), p. 15.
[14]Kenneth Burke, *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), pp. 307–308.

Lennon as Beatle

Lennon's relationship with his fans clearly was founded on his membership in the Beatles. Although he well might have become a songwriter and singer on his own, the fact is that he made it with the Beatles. From the time of their first tour in America and their top billing on the Ed Sullivan show in February 1964, the Beatles dominated the music scene of the 1960s. Their popularity was enormous:

> For a large part of the '60s, the Beatles were possibly the most famous men in the world. There is no way in which their all-powerful, all-embracing domination of the music scene from 1963–67 can be adequately described. In those years just to say "The Beatles" was enough. To anyone who was over 10 and under 30. . . , the Beatles meant more than songs, performances and records: they meant a lifestyle, dress, slang, attitudes, humour and hair. They created a culture.[15]

The Beatles' take-over of America was not at all planned, however; rather, their fame was sudden, overwhelming, and unbelievable to them. In his biography of the Beatles, Norman described the Beatles' reaction upon learning that "I Want to Hold Your Hand" had become number one on the music charts in the United States: "The Beatles couldn't even speak—not even John Lennon."[16] Despite continued reports of their popularity in America, the Beatles remained doubtful about their potential for success. George Harrison, one of the Beatles, voiced the fear all of them felt when he said, "They've got everything over there . . . What do they want *us* for?"[17] Thus, comprehension of and adjustment to the fame suddenly thrust upon them was difficult.

The Beatles' fame especially was enigmatic, though, for John Lennon. As one writer described, "if the Beatles were a common adventure, John Lennon was its point man and its center."[18] Clearly perceived as

[15]Robert Burt, comp., *John Lennon: A Man Who Cared* (Ridgefield, Conn.: Paradise Press, 1980), p. 10.
[16]Phillip Norman, *Shout! The Beatles in Their Generation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), p. 214.
[17]Norman, *Shout!*, p. 214.
[18]Greil Marcus, "Life and Life Only," *Rolling Stone*, January 22, 1981, p. 26.

leader, Lennon struggled with and felt trapped by the image of a superstar. This feeling of entrapment was, in fact, the focus of the 1964 Beatles' film, *A Hard Day's Night,* in which they were portrayed as trying to escape from their huge success. Lennon admitted, too, that his song "Help" was really just that—a personal cry for help because he felt suffocated by the Beatles' "image."[19] The lyrics to "I'm a Loser" also revealed this same sentiment: "Although I laugh and act like a clown/Beneath this mask I am wearing a frown."[20]

While Lennon resented the pressures of notoriety, then, his fans valued their identification with him as a Beatle and wanted to maintain this level as a primary one in their relationship with him. Lennon's attention and focus, however, were directed at the two higher levels of the hierarchy—his personal self and society as a whole. Thus, when the Beatles broke up in 1970 after fourteeen years together, Lennon's reaction was one of relief.[21]

Lennon's Personal Self

Throughout the Beatle years that served as the foundation of Lennon's relationship to his fans, he courted another level—his personal and artistic self: "For five Beatlemaniac years he has been struggling to keep his own personality together while the world tried to turn him into a cuddly Mop Top."[22] In fact, the tensions of the Beatle years only heightened his restlessness. He continually sought, in his music and his life, the right to exist on his own terms. Although his fans at times resisted a relationship on these terms, telling the truth as he saw it became a trademark and was a common characteristic praised in the discourse after his death. Ritchie York, for instance, said: "He was just determined to be truthful, whatever the cost."[23] Howard Cosell expressed the same sentiment: "I'll tell you something that no one should forget about John Lennon. He was *never ever* a hypocrite about anything he ever did or said or believed."[24] In fact, this authenticity caused Cosell to decide to interrupt a tied football game to announce Lennon's death: "I was wrestling with the problem of breaking the news on TV, thinking that, even in this sick, sports-obsessed country, *this* is far more important than any goddamned football game will ever be."[25]

Peace and Harmony in Society

There remained a final level—the top of the hierarchy—for Lennon and his fans. This ideal was a peaceful, truthful society. This vision was embodied in the rebellion and goals of the 1960s, and Lennon and many of his fans were caught up in the era. Striving for this ideal of society especially captivated Lennon: Beatles' songs were played at Vietnam protests and rallies, and many of his later songs clearly were written to have an anti-establishment impact. "Power to the People," "Happy Xmas (War is Over)," "Revolution," "Give Peace a Chance," and "Imagine" all expressed his sense of injustice and hope for change. Lennon described the intent behind such songs in his explanation of "Give Peace a Chance":

> "All we're saying is give peace a chance" literally came out of my mouth to a reporter after being asked for the millionth time: "what are you doing?" Not that I have the answer or I've got a new format for society, cause I don't and I don't believe anybody else has. Show me the plan before we knock all the buildings down . . . but give peace a chance.[26]

Burke maintains that the hierarchic ideal motivates people to strive upward, yet it is itself unattainable. The discourse that emerged after Lennon's death suggested that

[19] Jann S. Wenner, "Lennon Remembers," *Rolling Stone,* January 22, 1981, p. 86.

[20] Burt, *John Lennon,* p. 58.

[21] In fact, ten years after the break-up of the Beatles, Lennon still had no regrets: "The four guys who used to be that group can never ever be that group again even if they wanted to be . . . going back to the Beatles would be like going back to school. . . . I was never one for reunions. It's all over." See "The Real John Lennon," *Newsweek,* September 29, 1980, p. 77.

[22] Burt, *John Lennon,* p. 60.

[23] "John Lennon: 1940–1980," *Rolling Stone,* January 22, 1981, p. 5.

[24] "John Lennon," *Rolling Stone,* p. 56.

[25] "John Lennon," *Rolling Stone,* p. 56.

[26] "The Final Interview," *Songwriter,* January/February 1981, pp. 37.

he was aware of the unattainable nature of his goal, but that he was willing to continue to work for it nonetheless. The following statement from his final interview frequently was quoted in the eulogies:

> You have to give thanks to God or whatever is up there. The fact that we all survived. We all survived Vietnam, Watergate, the tremendous upheaval of the whole world. We were the hit ones in the '60s, but the world is not like the '60s, the whole map's changed and we're going into an unknown future, but we're still all here.[27]

Each level of the hierarchy that comprised the relationship between Lennon and his fans was valued differently by each party. Lennon clearly sought to focus the relationship on the societal ideal he hoped to help bring about while simultaneously maintaining his personal integrity. For him, his years as a Beatle no longer were central to his identity, and he wanted his fans to move beyond this level and beyond any personal sense of identification with him to focus on what needed to be done in society. Lennon's fans, however, were reluctant to abandon the Beatle image they associated with Lennon. They wanted to continue to maintain a strong identification with that primary level of the hierarchy, even after the break-up of the Beatles. When encouraged by Lennon to move beyond this level, their focal point became not how to change society, but Lennon the man—the second rung of the hierarchy. In a sense, they focused on this level to such an extent that they sublimated the hierarchy's ideal to Lennon the man. In other words, his fans treated Lennon as the hierarchic ideal and made him responsible for the attainment of the societal changes they themselves sought.

That Lennon's fans perceived him as above his societal ideal can be seen throughout the eulogies and tributes offered to him. In many of these, the death of Lennon was said to represent the death of the 1960s. The following is typical: "He carried some archetype within him, an archetype that held millions of young people in the '60s (he helped make the music that coincided with and inspired the ideas of inner transformation, the revolution of consciousness)."[28] Another writer described his reaction to Lennon's death as the realization that "I had formed my adult life around this guy in very serious ways."[29] Perhaps Aaron Copeland best captured the centrality of Lennon and the Beatles to people's perceptions in the 1960s when he said, "When people ask to recreate the mood of he Sixties, they will play Beatle music."[30]

By turning Lennon into a symbol of the 1960s, though, his fans imprisoned him in their expectations. As the top of the hierarchy, Lennon was expected to behave perfectly—i.e., in ways that fit his fans' views of how one in his position should behave. One such set of expectations involved a sense of superiority about the era of the 1960s that they expected Lennon to maintain: "You see them on the streets, 16- and 17-year-olds, with orange hair and thin black sunglasses. They are Young People, . . . But they are imposters; genuine young people went to high school in the sixties and their favorite group is the Beatles."[31] Any behavior that did not perpetuate this generation, therefore, was expecially traumatic for his fans because the split violated the core of their expectations. As one fan put it: "They [the Beatles] could, in their marvelous music, move from a self in isolation to an ideal community, and we did expect them to be that self-ratifying community forever."[32]

Lennon's relationship with Yoko Ono offers another place in which to see the expectations of his fans in operation. Lennon and Ono's relationship was resented because Ono was blamed for the break-up of the Beatles, because she was not the kind of

[27]"The Final Interview," *Songwriter*, p. 40.

[28]Robin Woodsworth Carlsen, "The Authenticity and the Integrity of John Lennon's Protest," letter to the editor, *New York Times*, December 23, 1980, p. 14.

[29]Wenner, "Lennon Remembers," p. 92.

[30]Aaron Copland, cited in *Great Songs of Lennon and McCartney*, ed. Milton Okun (New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Company, 1974), p. 8.

[31]Richard Brookhiser, "John Lennon, RIP," *National Review*, December 31, 1980, p. 1555.

[32]John Leonard, "Lennon Energized High Art with Pop," *New York Times*, December 14, 1980, sec. 2, p. 30.

woman they imagined for Lennon, and because she seemed to have so much influence over him. Consequently, she was viewed by many of his fans as a "witchy parasite": "Fans were in the habit of calling her Nip and handing her clusters of yellow rose, thorns first."[33]

Lennon further violated his fan's expectations by retiring from public life and from recording after the birth of his son, Sean, in order to devote himself full time to parenting. Not only were his fans disappointed because he was not turning out music but also because he obviously had returned to the family values that many of them had rejected during the 1960s. "Watching the Wheels," on Lennon's last album, was a response to this expectation of his fans:

> People say I'm crazy doing what I'm doing
> Well they give me all kinds of warnings to save me from ruin
> When I say that I'm o.k. they look at me kind of strange
> Surely you're not happy now you no longer play the game.[34]

Lennon's fans, then, seemed to want to preserve above all the sense of perfection they associated with Lennon, the Beatles, and the era of the 1960s. They resented behavior that deviated from this perspective because it violated the hierarchical ideal and the rules which they thought ought to govern that ideal.

A natural outcome of the process of making Lennon into a symbol of the 1960s was his dehumanization. Such depersonalization is typical of hierarchies, according to Burke:

> When a figure becomes the personification of some impersonal motive, the result is *depersonalization*. The person becomes the charismatic vessel of some "absolute" substance. And when thus magically endowed, the person transcends his nature as an individual, becoming instead the image of the idea he stands for.[35]

Marsh, in a eulogy in *Rolling Stone,* offered an extended example of the unconscious, yet clearly evident, dehumanization process as it operated with Lennon. Marsh began by describing an open letter he himself had written to Lennon in 1977, asking him to "come out of retirement and help make sense of events." Lennon reacted by saying, "I don't fucking owe anybody anything. I've done my part. It's everybody else's turn now."[36] This exchange caused Marsh to realize the responsibility that fans thrust on Lennon and the detrimental effects it produced: "I took it for granted that John Lennon existed to pump out entertainment, inspiration, and insight. It never occurred to me, until then, that my attitude reduced someone I thought I loved and admired to the status of a vending machine."[37]

Mark David Chapman, Lennon's assassin, simply epitomized the process of symbolization and subsequent dehumanization in which Lennon's fans engaged. Chapman's behavior was different only in degree: "To be famous to the degree that John Lennon was famous is to risk being regarded as property. Get a star's autograph and you possess a little bit of him; be hungry enough to take his life and you've got it all. Adulation takes strange forms, and murder is among them."[38] Lennon's fans merely paved the way for Chapman's act: They symbolically had tried to assassinate Lennon throughout his life—to destroy who he really was and to make him into what they wanted him to be. In this context, Chapman's act does not seem bizarre but rather understandable and even expected. Chapman focused on Lennon as symbol as had most of Lennon's fans. Whereas his fans' efforts to alter Lennon's focus and perpetuate the roles of Beatle superstar and symbol for the 1960s failed, Chapman's efforts to destroy him physically were successful.

The process of making Lennon a symbol

[33] John Blake, "John & Yoko," *US,* December 8, 1981, p. 71. Excerpted from Blake, *All You Needed Was Love: The Beatles After The Beatles* (Perigee/G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1981).
[34] John Lennon, "Watching the Wheels," *Double Fantasy,* 1980.
[35] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 277.
[36] Dave Marsh, "Ghoulish Beatlemania," *Rolling Stone,* January 22, 1981, p. 29.
[37] Marsh, "Ghoulish Beatlemania," p. 29.
[38] "Forms of Adulation," editorial, *New York Times,* December 10, 1980, p. 30.

and the accompanying dehumanization carried with it guilt for Lennon's fans. Guilt, according to Burke, cannot be separated from the notion of hierarchy. Hierarchies are a source of guilt because we continually strive to achieve the ideal at the top but never are able to do so. The levels of the hierarchy itself also promote a sense of guilt: "Those 'Up' are guilty of not being 'Down,' those 'Down' are certainly guilty of not being 'Up.' "[39] To remove the ever-present guilt, humans have two ways of redemption open to them—mortification and victimage. In mortification, we inflict punishment on ourselves in order to achieve purification. In victimage we transfer our guilt to someone else, making him or her a scapegoat: "To make others suffer for our sins is victimage; to make ourselves suffer is mortification."[40]

During Lennon's life, his fans had dealt with their guilt by making him the scapegoat or victim—i.e., by thrusting their expectations for the relationship onto him and trying to make him what they wanted him to be. They focused on the first level of the hierarchy—Lennon as Beatle—long after Lennon pointed out that the Beatles were no longer a group and never would be again. When they finally shifted their focus to another level, it was not to the societal ideals important to Lennon but to Lennon the man. They attended to the hierarchic ideal only to the point of making Lennon responsible for accomplishing those ideals. The guilt inherent in Lennon's fans' expectations, however, was not acknowledged by them while Lennon was alive. Hardly aware of what they were doing to Lennon, his fans did not experience their guilt because they refused to take responsibility for it, thrusting it upon Lennon instead.

Advisory Function of the Eulogies

After Lennon's death, the eulogistic discourse generated in response played an important role in shifting his fans' orientation toward Lennon and toward their own guilt. In fact, this discourse served to advise his fans on how to handle their guilt, and it did so by advocating changes in thinking at three levels. First, the discourse created an awareness among Lennon's fans of how much they had distorted their relationship with Lennon to suit their own needs—i.e., that they had neglected the hierarchic level most important to Lennon and instead had focused on him as some kind of ideal. Implicit in this awareness was the extent to which they had attempted a symbolic assassination not that different from what Chapman finally accomplished. This theme emerged repeatedly in the discourse: "People ask, 'Who killed John Lennon?' when after all it was you and me."[41] Ironically, of course, Lennon had survived the efforts of his fans to refocus their relationship and shift his priorities only to be killed physically:

> "He beat the rock-'n'-roll life," Steven Van Zendt said the day after Lennon died. "Beat the drugs, beat the fame, beat the damage. He was the only guy who beat it all." That was the victory Mark Chapman took from John Lennon, who had an abundance of what everyone wants and wanted only what so many others have, and take for granted. A home and family. Some still small center of love. A life. One minute more.[42]

The eulogies, then, asked fans to examine their behavior and acknowledge how insensitive they had been to what Lennon himself wanted in terms of a relationship with the public.

Second, the eulogies functioned to show the fans the extent of their symbolization of Lennon and how they had valued the symbol more than the man. A *Rolling Stone* writer captured this notion:

> John Lennon's murder does not symbolize the irrevocable ending of the Sixties: the blood he spilled was real. And that decade ended just when the calendar says it did. Nor is his death the end of the Beatles. Lennon painstakingly laid out the facts of that situation . . . a decade ago, . . . Finally, he was most certainly killed not by fame but by four highly unmetaphoric bullets.[43]

[39]Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action*, p. 15.
[40]William Rueckert, *Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), p. 147.
[41]Paul Panichelli, "Letters," *Rolling Stone*, January 22, 1981, p. 8.
[42]Jay Cocks, "The Last Day in the Life," *Time*, December 22, 1980, p. 24.
[43]Marsh, "Ghoulish Beatlemania," p. 29.

The discourse, then, advised Lennon's fans to become aware of the symbolization process and the detrimental effects it can have on the person so symbolized.

A third advisory function fulfilled by the eulogies was to encourage Lennon's fans to shift their hierarchic emphasis to correspond with what Lennon's had been. Rather than focusing on Lennon as a symbol for the 1960s, the discourse suggested that they focus on the ideals of the 1960s as their goal. Ironically, none of Lennon's efforts throughout his life had been able to accomplish this shift as well as his death did. This need to reorient to the original ideal of the hierarchy—a peaceful, harmonious society—was a strong theme, then, in the eulogistic discourse:

> Some of us—the survivors—joined the establishment and became successful, but what kind of success? Our selfish success achieved recognition and made money—plenty of it. Our stomachs got fuller, rounder, our apartments more comfortable, our children more spoiled. What happened to our goals to change the world? Did we fight in '68 for the Eighties to give us Ronald Reagan?
>
> It's time to react against our own apathy. . . . It is time to get together and fight, fight for the quality of life we deserve, the quality of people we can be . . .[44]

The discourse that followed Lennon's death, then, served an advisory function for his fans on several levels. It promoted an awareness of how they selfishly had distorted their relationship with Lennon while he was alive; it suggested the extent to which they made Lennon a symbol for the entire hierarchy rather than striving for the societal ideals which Lennon saw as the ultimate goal; and it advocated that they focus their lives on what the focus of Lennon's life had been. Thus, while Lennon's fans essentially had dealt with their guilt through victimage while he was alive, in the eulogies they were asked to reverse this process and to engage in mortification. Rather than foisting responsibility for their relationship and for the ideal of the hierarchy onto Lennon, they were asked to assume the responsibility for what they had done to him. The eulogies facilitated the shift from scapegoating to mortification or self-blame, of which the following is but one example:

> Like so many of us, I sat watching *Monday Night Football* on December 8th, really believing it was important for Miami to win so that the Steelers could have a chance at the playoffs. Then I heard that John Lennon had been murdered. Suddenly, I realized that none of the petty, day-to-day distractions in which we so wholeheartedly believe can ever approach the importance of this man, who loved the world's people enough to express himself unashamedly throughout his life. Where are our priorities?[45]

Conclusion

The death of John Lennon generated much praise and tribute accompanied by an underlying but rather strong hortatory tone. When looked at in its entirety, the body of eulogistic discourse surrounding Lennon's death appealed to his fans to change how they conceived of and what they valued about their relationship with Lennon. This study also made use of what I have called eulogistic discourse, which can provide the rhetorical critic with important information that often is overlooked.

While I suspect that advice such as that discovered in the eulogies for Lennon is present to some degree in any eulogy, the nature of it and the extent to which it appears undoubtedly vary. Perhaps the eulogistic discourse generated around those who die of natural causes is much less hortatory, for example, than in cases of assassination. The source of the deceased's renown also may be a constraint on this advisory function. Is a group of followers less in need of advice, perhaps, if the deceased is a politician than if he or she is a musician or social leader? And are efforts to inspire change in the audience more characteristic of informal eulogistic tributes—as those of Lennon tended to be—than formal ones? These questions only begin to suggest the range of studies possible about eulogies and their advisory capabilities.

[44]Diane Von Furstenberg, "Letters," *Rolling Stone*, January 22, 1981, p. 11.

[45]Dave Molter, "Letters," *Rolling Stone*, January 22, 1981, p. 8.

SPECIAL REPORTS

TOWARD ANALYSES OF LIVE TELEVISION BROADCASTS

Barbra S. Morris and Joel Nydahl

When Gregor T. Goethals observes that "television needs many different interpretations—from humanistic perspectives to statistical analyses,"[1] he calls our attention to the diversity and complexity of television programming as well as to the need for a variety of research methodologies, each methodology appropriate to the content being explored as well as to the unique properties of the medium. The ways in which television manipulates messages according to the purposes of broadcasters need further study. In each genre of television programming the conventions of, and purposes for, structuring programs differ considerably from those of other genres. In this paper, we want to consider how television texts are shaped for live sports events.

The amount of television time given over to sports broadcasts is sufficient reason for more precise study of the presentations of these events; indeed, the recent emergence of a network devoted solely to sports coverage indicates that the importance of this genre in the lives of a large percentage of the viewing public is likely to increase. The fact, however, that sports events are the principal subject matter for *live* broadcasts seemed to us the most compelling reason for developing a methodology appropriate to their study. Live telecasts of any kind possess a sense of "reality" which make them powerful transmitters and developers of ideologies and potential subliminal creators of propaganda.

The analysis of the televised text of any live event poses a special problem: the program is spontaneous, hence unscripted. When programs are live, we, as viewers, tend to accept such messages as real rather than mediated; and, because the television presentation is unscripted, it is difficult, if not impossible, for researchers to study precisely how mediation takes place.

As a first step in the analysis of sports broadcasting, we needed to address the major obstacle to most analyses of television content: the difficulty of discriminating among simultaneous and rapidly changing elements in the text in order to speculate about their significance. This problem is further complicated in a study of live sports telecasting because the action of the contest itself dominates the viewing experience. Nevertheless, we decided it was essential to isolate and compare production elements of a major sports presentation because the manipulations of content to create drama in a televised game would be the focus of our investigation.

To carry out this research, we set out to accomplish two goals: (1) to discriminate between, yet interrelate, the two kinds of television "language"; and (2) to understand the effects of technological manipulations of viewers' perceptions of the event. We needed to design a method for matching up image and commentary and for registering such visual elements as cuts from shot to shot and slow-motion replays in order to weight the

Professors Morris and Nydahl are members of the English Composition Board of the University of Michigan.

[1] *The TV Ritual: Worship at the Video Altar* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1981), p. 3.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 34 (Fall 1983), 195-202

impact of their uses. Only with a written representation of the event before us could we analyze constituent parts of the visual presentation (length of time devoted to each camera shot, manner of transition from shot to shot, and use of various camera angles and image manipulators). And, only by means of a transcription of the oral and written elements (differences in slant and substance among commentators' observations and superimpositions of statistics) could we begin our analysis of the probable impacts upon viewers of both commentary and image.

We first created a fixed written text (see Example 1)—an invented script of the "live" video event. It enabled us to put "the television experience at a distance in order to 'read' it"[2] and to examine closely the oral text in relation to a written approximation of the visual one.

We selected as our video text the CBS production of the much advertised and anticipated 1982 NCAA championship basketball game between North Carolina and Georgetown.[3] Since it was one for which CBS was certain to employ its most sophisticated equipment and its most talented personnel, we would be investigating a telecast of a major sports spectacle and would be likely to discover the maximum potential for television mediation of an event in order to intensify the drama of the contest for viewers.

We next developed a method of constructing a written version of the television production by viewing the preliminary quarter- and semi-final basketball games of the NCAA tournament. We codified basic camera shots and types of commentary in order to ascertain the dominant patterns of coverage in network broadcasting of major college basketball games. While we focused upon elements common to these basketball telecasts, we also discussed idiosyncratic televised presentations of college basketball games which we recalled from our past viewing experiences in order to consider more completely the history of production techniques and their place in our responses to televised basketball games in general.

During these observations of preliminary games and through lengthy discussions, we began to find categories within our two major classifications of televised information: "Basic Techniques of Visual Presentation" (see Example 2) and "Basic Types of Television Sports Commentary" (see Example 3). Neither taxonomy of terms emerged easily, however; it was especially difficult to differentiate among varieties of commentary. Beginning our analysis by identifying fourteen discrete kinds of statements, we first reduced that number to eight, then later settled upon ten: three kinds of basic information (external reportage) and seven types of rhetorical elaborations (internal reportage).

Similarly, it was not a simple matter to settle upon adequate classifications of camera shots; we found, for instance, no precise demarcation between long and medium shots nor between medium and close ones. At first, in fact, the number of different kinds of shots appeared limitless, particularly in this major contest: cameras were placed throughout the arena. For example, the director chose to place a camera directly above center court in order to present a shot in which the players seemed more like X's and O's on a locker room blackboard than flesh-and-blood athletes. As was the case with our classification of commentary, however, we settled upon a manageable and usable list of basic camera angles which seemed preferable to attempting to find names for all unique variations.

We settled upon the final classifications only after we had videotaped and repeatedly viewed the actual championship game between North Carolina and Georgetown. We had never had so clear a sense of the ephemeral and impressionistic nature of most television analyses until we achieved some control of our own material. For instance, when we had tried taking notes during the telecasts of preliminary games, our research sessions had been frantic and

[2]John Fiske and John Hartley, *Reading Television* (London: Methuen, 1978), p. 67.
[3]Directed by Robert Fishman, 29 March 1982.

Example 1.

Sample Video Text: 1982 NCAA Championship Basketball

Shot	Subject	Time	Commentary		
			Kind	Content	Speaker
MCS F	Two Georgetown guards bring the ball down court.	:08	OBJ	. . . comes to Fred Brown.	B
PO	Fred Brown makes a bad pass.		SPEC/ MET	The momentum's changing.	P
LS F	Matt Doherty intercepts for North Carolina. Doherty passes down court to James Worthy.		OBJ/ CRIT	Brown mishandled the ball.	B
PI	Worthy dribbles to basket and slam-dunks over Eric "Sleepy" Floyd.		EMP	Look out! Look out!	P
EXT CU	Worthy moving up court.	:03	OBJ OBJ	The basket will count and this foul will go	B B
EXT CU	Two fans, one with his face painted blue waving a pom-pom.	:02	OBJ	on "Sleepy" Floyd.	B
LS PO	North Carolina partisans waving pom-poms.	:02			
EXT CU (two-shot)	Worthy and Doherty talking and moving down court.	:01			
IRIS OUT	SLOW-MOTION REPLAY				
(fore-shortened) (low angle)	With other players trailing down court in the background, Doherty launches a pass in the direction of the camera. Worthy enters the frame from the left, catches the ball, and dribbles toward the basket. He takes a long leap and slam-dunks over Floyd.	:10	INTER/ MET OBJ HIST	Just when you think the momentum is goin' all Georgetown . . . Worthy gets it. "Sleepy" Floyd's seen this play before.	P P P
FREEZE	Worthy suspended in air, stuffing ball in basket over Floyd.	:01	EMP	There's no way	P
MS F (high angle) F	Worthy dribbles the ball toward the basket; Floyd and North Carolina's Michael Jorden come into view. Worthy slam-dunks over Floyd. Jordan standing under basket waiting for the rebound.	:05	EMP EMP OBJ	he's going to stop James Worth on that dunk. And listen to the fans in here. They see it on the big screen over again,	P P P
FREEZE IRIS IN	Jordan under basket.	:01	SUBJ	and they're enjoyin' it.	P
LS	Crowd cheering.	:03	HIST	Two men from Gastonia, North Carolina	B
EXT CU	Cheerleader clapping, turns to camera, smiles, waves at us, and says, "Hi, Mom. Hi, Mom and Dad!"	:06	HIST	meeting there. Both went to the same church. They did not go to the same high school. They met one year	B
FREEZE CU	John Thompson, Georgetown coach, and "Sleepy" Floyd: a family-style portrait pose captured during an earlier portion of the game. SUPER: Georgetown 49 N. Carolina 47 2nd half	:04	HIST	in the state championship finals.	B

Example 2.

Basic Techniques of Visual Presentation: TV Basketball Coverage

I. USES OF THE CAMERA
  A. Stationary angles
    1. Long shot (LS)
      a) Mid-court standard (MCS): from stationary camera located in or above the stands at the ten-second line
      b) End-court standard (ECS): from stationary camera located high in the stands behind one or both baskets
    2. Medium shot (MS)
      a) Mid-court standard (MCS): from same camera and location as analogous long shot
      b) End-court standard (ECS): from same camera and location as analogous long shot
      c) End-court low (ECL): from hand-held cameras located at floor-level behind one or both baskets
    3. Close shot
      a) Close-up (CU): from any camera at any position
      b) Extreme close-up (EXT CU): from any camera at any position
  B. Moving angles: from any camera at any position
    1. Pull/zoom in (PI)
    2. Pull/zoom out (PO)
    3. Follow/track (F)
  C. Manipulated angles: from any camera at any position
    1. Slow-motion replay
    2. Freeze-frame (FREEZE)
II. SHOT-TO-SHOT TRANSITIONS
  A. Standard (hence, not indicated): every new shot generally CUT TO
  B. Exceptions (always indicated)
    1. DISSOLVE TO
    2. FADE OUT or FADE IN: usually used before and after commercial breaks
    3. IRIS OUT or IRIS IN: used almost exclusively to introduce and break from slow-motion replays
III. OPTICAL EFFECTS
  A. Superimposition (SUPER): used to indicate score or game or statistics
  B. Insert: used to show simultaneous views, e.g. of individuals or score or time remaining

self-defeating; our eyes would be on our note pads, though we needed to be looking at the screen.

By contrast to early efforts at note-taking, the taxonomies of terms worked together with the written text of game segments to contribute to our understanding of the whole. By writing out *all* commentary exactly as it occurred during selected portions of the game, we were able to identify patterns within the flow of words, and by logging and timing action as it appeared on the screen and then analyzing it later, we could hypothesize about the effects of camera usage in manipulating audience response.

As we examined the complete transcripts of selected clips from the game, we discovered that announcers' comments fell into patterns which recurred rather frequently. For example, one pattern of commentary we found was an objective-interpretive-speculative one:

(Obj) 5:41 to go.
(Inter) North Carolina's sittin' on it.
(Spec) Ewing's gotta be careful.

Example 3.

Basic Types of Television Sports Commentary

BASIC (gives account of game)	*ELABORATIVE* (intensifies the dramatic impact of game)
Objective (OBJ) (An objective observation of either action or fact during game) "The basket will count; 5:41 to go!"	*Motivational* (MOT) (An attribution of motive for behavior) "They're going to force Martin to show he can make a shot from the outside."
Interpretive (INTER) (An expert interpretation of execution or flow of play) "We're seeing a little four corners right here."	*Speculative* (SPEC) (An educated guess about game as it is in progress) "The momentum's changing."
Historical (HIST) (A placing of individuals or events in historical or statistical meta-perspective) "He's second only to Phil Ford, all-time North Carolina assist list."	*Foreshadowing* (FORE) (An intuition or insight suggesting a possible or probable impact on outcome of entire game) "That play will be remembered in this game."
	Critical (CRIT) (A general assessment of blame) "That's one of the assets he has, and a lot of people don't rate it."
	Metaphoric (MET) (An implied or direct comparison) "So we really have a coaching clinic going on right now."
	Empathetic (EMP) (An attempt to make viewers feel what another feels) "Think he's thinking a little bit?"
	Subjective (SUBJ) (Subjective comment characterizing behavior) "Patrick Ewing is so aggressive."

A second common pattern was objective-speculative-objective:

(Obj) He had over 500 assists in his career.
(Spec) And now important free throws coming up.
(Obj) 73% free throw shooter.

A third pattern used during slow-motion replays was objective-historical-empathetic:

(Obj) Worthy gets it.
(Hist) Sleepy Floyd's seen this play before.
(Emp) There's no way he's going to stop James Worthy on that dunk.

Finally, during this game our log of the text revealed that types of commentary shifted as play progressed. During the first half there were eleven foreshadowing comments ("... something we should keep in mind—that North Carolina's been a great second-half ball club during the tournament") and thirty-nine critical comments ("He's turned the ball over a couple of times"). In the second half, however, there were twenty-two foreshadowing comments and twenty-five critical comments. Thus, while viewers were led or were forced to attend primarily to players' skill of execution early in the game, in the late stages of the contest they began speculating (or listening to speculations) about how execution would influence outcome.

Television sports commentary is characterized, we found, by an accumulation of interior statements (which influence the pace of the event through their patterns) and by the building of tension through increased use of suspenseful references by commentators as the conclusion of the game approaches.

Similarly, as we examined our invented transcript of the visual portion of the television "text," we began to perceive how manipulations of time and space and how juxtapositions of disparate scenes from around the arena created a version of the game that no spectator would experience in the arena while watching the actual event.

From a stationary vantage point in the arena, the spectator's experience of a representative live play might be something like this: In a single, continuous flow of action, two players bring the ball across the ten-second line; as they begin to work the ball in toward the basket, one player throws a bad pass which an opposing player intercepts; he immediately passes to a teammate at the ten-second line, who dribbles down court; as this player makes his drive to the basket, a defensive player positions himself under the basket in order to attempt to block the shot; the player with the ball, however, will not be denied; he sails up and over the defender and emphatically slam-dunks the ball for two points; the crowd roars its approval of one of its favorite athletes performing brilliantly.

On television, however, such a scene is rarely perceived as an uninterrupted flow; the action usually begins with a standard mid-court shot from high in the stands and thereafter action is segmented by switches to different camera shots; usually we are given several separate viewpoints which rapidly move us closer to the action and isolate details central to the action. Also, we might see a dramatic postscript: a close-up profile of the player who slam-dunked the ball; shots showing elated fans' reactions to that play (a tight profile of one cheering supporter, followed by a long shot of a large section of the frenzied crowd); and, finally, a two-shot of the athletes responsible for the beautifully executed play—the one who intercepted the ball and passed it and the other who slam-dunked—both smiling in triumph, filling the screen as they dominate our sense of the world of the basketball court.

Thus the director, because of the available technology, has control of our point of view. Multiple cameras allow him to divide a single action into separately distinguishable new units of purposive, dramatic action[4] and to fuse these units into an idiosyncratic "plot" not unlike that which we might find in a novel or a play. Together, the producer, the director, and the commentators build new meanings into ongoing action—compelling

[4]Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 14.

"story lines"[5] which originate in, but are themselves only tangentially related to, "real life": Not only would we, as spectators at the game, not be empowered to connect the wealth of primary material together, as directors and producers routinely do, but we would never be able to call upon close-up shots of players' or fans' faces (unless we happened to be sitting nearby) to intensify our feeling for their individual experiences; nor could we restructure the flow of action as it actually occurs.

That these stories are constructed from events in the arena, and are frequently "hyped" long before the game begins, reinforces their close relation to the actual event. Much was made, for example, of James Worthy, of North Carolina, and Eric "Sleepy" Floyd, of Georgetown, having attended the same church but different schools in Gastonia, North Carolina, and having played against each other in the state tournament. During the game this Gastonia connection was emphasized at every opportunity, until an almost mythic rivalry was established; thus, a minor motif can be woven into televised live action.

What gives ultimate verisimilitude to such television fictions, however, is that they are presented not only in words but in images through what Len Masterman has called the "transparency" of the medium:[6] The viewer is conscious of the subject, not the means of presentation; of the tenor, not the vehicle; or, in the terms used by Roland Barthes, the viewer is aware only of the "signified," not the "signifier." Barthes, discussing another, similar, medium goes on to say that:

> A specific photograph, in effect, is never distinguished from its referent (from what it represents), or at least it is not immediately and generally distinguished from its referent . . . : It is not impossible to perceive the photographic signifier (certainly professionals do so), but it requires a secondary action of knowledge or of reflection.[7]

* * * *

> It is as if the Photograph always carries its referent with itself . . . [T]hey are glued together . . . as though united by an eternal coitus. The Photograph belongs to that class of laminated objects whose two leaves cannot be separated without destroying them both: the window-pane and the landscape . . . Whatever it grants to vision and whatever its manner, a photograph is always invisible; it is not it that we see. In short, the referent adheres.[8]

Such a disassociation of appearance and reality produces a kind of irony which needs investigation, for this irony is transmitted by means of a public medium with tremendous power to persuade viewers and establish (and confirm) ideologies.

The single device most central to the manipulation of live events in order to create drama in televised sports seems to be the slow-motion replay. This device enables the director to present insights that not only alter viewers' understanding of the original event, but also create new events outside of "real" time and space.

No better analysis of both the history and the recognized potential of the slow-motion replay can be found than in Erik Barnouw's *Tube of Plenty;* at one point he traces the rapid commercial success of television coverage of football. "A factor in the rise of football as television fare," he writes,

> was the "instant replay," so tellingly used in the Oswald murder. A few weeks later, on New Year's Eve, it was used in the Army–Navy football game, and in 1964 it became a standard sports technique. While one camera showed the overall action "live," other cameras followed key players close-up, with each camera linked to a separate videotape machine. Within seconds after a play, its crucial action could be re-examined in close-up, or even unfolded in startling slow-motion. This accomplished incredible transformations: brutal collisions became ballets, and end runs and forward passes became miracles of human coordination. Football, once an un-

[5] Harry Coyle, who directed the first World Series game on television in 1947, told us in an interview in New York City in the summer of 1982: "We always look for the story in the game. We never impose it, but we always look for it."

[6] *Teaching About Television* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1980), p. 9.

[7] *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Hill and Wang, 1981), p. 5.

[8] *Camera*, p. 6.

fathomable jumble on the small screen, acquired fascination for widening audiences.[9]

These "incredible transformations" are, of course, the very stuff of which the production of television sports spectacles—for that is what they have by now become—is made.

The main concern of television producers is, after all, to prevent viewer boredom. From the point of view of the networks, the sports spectacle is spectacle first and sports second; while the viewer is interested in the game, the network is interested in the viewer; to the network, the game is to catch the viewer. "To understand what the game [of television] is all about," says Robert Lewis Shayon, "one has to get rid of the notion that television is in the program business; nothing could be further from the truth. Television is in the crowd-catching business."[10]

Some critics, indeed, say that networks go too far in the direction of inventing drama and, thus, spoil the experience of the contest with a "maddening habit of switching replays and camera shots of coaches and cheering fans after baskets."[11] This complaint well might have included "... and telling us what we ought to think."

Such criticism of television sports coverage, well founded though it may be in the eyes of a fan of "real" sports events, ignores the television audience's appetite for live events re-arranged and re-experienced, and their preference for commentary that is rhythmic and intended to intensify experience. The drama of sports on television is created through accumulation; the text is rambling, repetitive, and recursive, in both its visual and verbal presentation. Directors and commentators, fully aware of the television audience's expectation that sports will be telecast in an exciting way, oblige us by providing magical transformations of reality while also recording the event.[12]

As we sit in front of the television set, then, the event is interpreted for us; we have been taught to read the juxtapositions of images designed elsewhere. In addition, the game's running commentary—whether historical, objective, or interpretive, by turn—translates the meaning of events in very prescribed ways for us.

We intend to undertake further study of this and other live texts; in doing so, we will continue to establish written transcriptions according to the form presented in Example 1. Interestingly enough, our fixed written texts have enriched discussions we have had with others about televised sports and have increased the range of questions raised about the televised segments. It is our hope, therefore, that our method of producing precise transcriptions of brief clips in order to study the complex "level[s] of Narration"[13] in televised sports events will encourage investigations of sociological and psychological meanings which can be recovered from unscripted, extemporaneous forms of television discourse.

[9](London: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 347–348.

[10]"Violence: TV's Crowd-Catcher," in *Short Essays: Models for Composition*, ed. Gerald Levin (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javonovich, 1980), p. 209. 2nd ed.

[11]Joe La Pointe, "Sports on the Air," Detroit *Free Press*, 30 May 1982, sec. E., p. 3. Appeared only in certain editions.

[12]Barbra S. Morris and Joel Nydahl, "Sports Spectacle as Drama: Image, Language, and Technology," unpublished essay, 1982.

[13]Roland Barthes, "Structural Analysis of Narratives," in *Image—Music—Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), p. 109.

RADIO FREE AMERICA: THE U.S. GOVERNMENT'S REACTION TO PIRATE RADIO

Douglas A. Boyd

There is a certain fascination in being able to broadcast whatever one wants without much reference to a higher authority, and provided the material is neither obscene nor seditious. It can sometimes be done.

Some U.S. citizens have constructed stations which have broadcast music and talk programming. These have been short-lived and have been the work of frustrated amateur radio broadcasters and pranksters rather than of those, for example in Europe, wanting to establish viable commercial stations or of those believing existing stations did not permit discussion of a particular political or social matter.

Reaction by government varies. Sometimes there is permission by license. Occasionally there is tolerance without overt permission, as was the case in Lebanon following the 1975–1976 civil war.[1] However, the more usual reaction is to ban and close stations, and it is in this context that the following study applies. Specifically, this study details the U.S. government's legal steps to stop a renegade preacher from broadcasting from international waters. For the purpose of analysis the one case of U.S. pirate broadcasting will be considered in three stages: motivation, operation, and reaction.

The literature on pirate stations is not abundant. Browne has written about the demise of the British pirate ships and platforms of the 1960s.[2] Kotschack[3] and Harris[4] published two interesting but not scholarly books on pirate operations off the coast of Great Britain and Sweden respectively. European off-shore pirates have essentially disappeared because organizations such as the Council of Europe and the International Telecommunications Union have promoted legislation and agreements which make it too difficult for them to function.

It is true that some European public broadcasting corporations allow commercial advertising, but the amount of advertising is restricted and is often permitted on a national and a regional, but not on a local, basis. Financial return has been a strong motivation behind European pirate stations. European pirates have believed that the established broadcasting bureaucracy permits neither sufficient political discussion nor program material serving minority and popular tastes.

It is remarkable that the American experience has to be drawn from one example only. In a country which is one of the homes of free speech, there seems to have been little incentive. One might have expected more outbursts. It is the uniqueness of "Radio Free America" which makes for such an intriguing story with so many overtones and under-

Professor Boyd is Chairman of the Department of Communication at the University of Delaware.

[1]Douglas A. Boyd, *Broadcasting in the Arab World: A Survey of Radio in the Middle East* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), pp. 71–5.

[2]Don R. Browne, "The BBC and the Pirates: A Phase in the Life of a Prolonged Monopoly," *Journalism Quarterly*, 48 (1971), 85–99.

[3]Jack S. Kotschack, *The Radio Nord Story* (London: Impulse Books, 963).

[4]Paul Harris, *To Be a Pirate King* (London: Impulse Books, 1971); Paul Harris, *When Pirates Ruled the Waves* (London: Impulse Books, 1968).

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 34 (Fall 1983), 203–209

currents because at the heart of the controversy is one man.

Reverend Carl McIntire

If anyone had the determination to build America's only pirate ship-based radio station, it was McIntire. In the 1930s he broke away from the United Presbyterian Church to establish his own denomination, the Bible Presbyterian Church in Collingswood, New Jersey. After World War II, he founded the American Council of Churches and later the International Council of Churches in opposition to the World Council of Churches. A fundamentalist and dedicated anti-communist, McIntire was particularly vocal during the 1960s and 1970s protesting the U.S. government's no-win Vietnam War policy.[5]

Dr. McIntire (an honorary doctorate from a Canadian seminary) had some considerable media expertise, but he was not like the electronic church leaders of the 1980s. Carl McIntire relied on his controversial speeches being covered on both national and local radio and television and the print media. Additionally, he had a syndicated radio program, the "Twentieth Century Reformation Hour," carried by stations throughout the U.S.; he operated a newspaper, *The Christian Beacon;* and he owned and operated WXUR in Media, Pennsylvania. The radio program usually featured McIntire speaking without a text, attacking individuals and organizations. In the late 1970s, many American stations carrying his program dropped it because of his attacks and because he did not pay promptly (or sometimes not at all) the stations broadcasting the program.[6] Many saw Reverend McIntire as too conservative, too controversial, and someone attempting to build a considerable financial empire through property purchases in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Florida. It is difficult to assess his following outside his church in Collingswood, New Jersey.

On April 29, 1965, McIntire's Faith Theological Seminary purchased WXUR-AM and WXUR-FM from Brandywine-Main Line Radio, Inc. The following day, the station began broadcasting the "Twentieth Century Reformation Hour." One of the main reasons for purchasing the Media, Pennsylvania, station was the cancellation of the McIntire radio program in 1963 by WYSH in neighboring Chester, Pennsylvania. Ironically, this program and others broadcast by WXUR soon resulted in the loss of the license to broadcast.

The FCC's Fairness Doctrine basically mandates that broadcasters permitting personal attacks must allow time for those attacked to reply. WXUR's only means of permitting on-the-air discussion of its programming was by a two-way telephone discussion. But the announcer on duty often guided discussions so that callers either could not really fully complain or were not permitted on the air at all.[7]

History shows that while the FCC and the federal court system are willing to revoke broadcasting licenses, such actions are rare. Most commercial operators are responsible business operators and a license is so potentially profit-returning that licensees strictly abide by the FCC's technical and programming regulations. When the FCC decides to deny a license renewal, its decision is not necessarily absolute: Most owners take a decision of non-renewal through the federal court system. Various hearings and appeals can take several years. This is why McIntire's Faith Theological Seminary, which financed the station's purchase, did not formally lose the license until the summer of 1973, eight years after its acquisition. The last appeal had been exhausted when the United States Supreme Court declined to intervene, thus allowing to stand a lower federal court decision to uphold the FCC's

[5]"Man in the News," *Broadcasting*, September 24, 1973, p. 21.

[6]Edward E. Plowman, "McIntire's Navy," *Liberty*, January-February, 1974, pp. 6-8.

[7]Federal Communications Commission, "Initial Decision of Hearing Examiner H. Gifford Irion," Issued December 10, 1969; Released December 13, 1968, Docket No. 17141, File Nos. BR-4178 and BRH-1320, pp. 4-5.

original non-renewal decision.[8] The FCC's ruling and the subsequent court decisions were based on WXUR's Fairness Doctrine violations and misrepresentations in the license renewal process.

Motivation

There are two main reasons that pirates have not flourished in the United States. First, the U.S. is rich in electronic media. Over 1,000 television and 9,000 AM and FM stations are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Second, the majority of licensed U.S. stations are commercial: Advertising revenue is their sole source of income, and hence there is no economic reason for pirates to start a commercial service.

However, in McIntire's case, because the permanent loss of WXUR seemed certain, he began to seek alternatives whereby he could remain a radio broadcaster and at the same time confront the U.S. government. Both on his syndicated radio program and at public rallies, he started talking about acquiring a ship, outfitting it with radio transmitting equipment and broadcasting from beyond the 3-mile international limit where he believed he was beyond the reach of federal regulatory bodies. Dr. McIntire reminded his supporters and critics alike that he had defied the United Presbyterian Church in 1936, "And now I'm prepared to defy the courts if they attempt to enjoin me from preaching the Gospel on that boat."[9]

Operation

During the summer of 1973, McIntire and his supporters started searching for a ship which would be suitable for radio operations off the U.S. East Coast. They succeeded in leasing an old World War II minesweeper from Wayne and Christopher Hansen of Miami, Florida.[10] A 10-kilowatt RCA transmitter and studio equipment were installed on the ship—officially registered in the U.S. as the *Oceanic*, but later named *Columbus* by McIntire.[11] The ship broadcasting operation immediately faced major problems, some similar to those encountered by the European pirate ships, some unique to Dr. McIntire. First, the process of installing a transmitter and antenna system to broadcast from a ship is technically difficult. Few engineers have experience with ship-based broadcasting transmitters. Second, such operations must have an adequate, constant, and reliable source of electrical power. Third, a system of supplying fuel, food, supplies, and personnel transport to the ship from land is necessary. Fourth, the entire operation is expensive. By 1973, McIntire's financial holdings were in a state of disarray because of WXUR legal battles as well as those to come with the ship. Additionally, he had over-extended himself by purchasing property in Florida and in Cape May, New Jersey, a resort area which became his land-based Radio Free America headquarters only a few miles from where transmission actually took place.

These problems did not prevent McIntire from bringing the radio-equipped ship to a location just outside the 3-mile international limit off the coast of New Jersey on 30 August 1973. The fact that the *Columbus* was leased, outfitted with the necessary radio equipment, and brought to New Jersey fulfilled one of Reverend McIntire's goals—attention in both the American and the international print and broadcast media. The publicity helped draw the prospect of an illegal radio station to the attention of the Coast Guard, the U.S. Justice Department, and the Federal Communications Commission, but no legal action could begin until broadcasting started.

Financial difficulties of the ship's sponsor and certain technical problems lengthened the time between the ship's arrival off Cape

[8]Plowman, p. 8.
[9]"Man in the News," p. 22.
[10]United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission vs. Reverend Carl McIntire, Wayne C. Hansen, and Christopher Hansen, United States District Court, District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 1367-73, Filed October 25, 1973, p. 2.
[11]"High Hopes on the High Seas: McIntire sets up his Pirate Radio Station," *Broadcasting*, September 10, 1973, p. 30.

May and broadcasting. The most immediate problems were technical. The ship was forced to return to port because an anchor broke. Those advising on the most appropriate broadcasting frequency could not decide on which wave length to transmit. The problem was which frequency on the AM band should be used to provide the best coverage but at the same time cause the least interference with other stations. McIntire's advisors suggested three desirable frequencies: 1160, 690, or 1613 kHz. A decision was made to use 1160.[12] The radio technicians aboard the ship had some experienced help; someone with engineering experience with Abie Nathan's Middle East peace ship came to advise on technical matters.[13] Although there were threats from the Justice Department and the FCC, the only direct contact McIntire had with government officials took place when the U.S. Coast Guard boarded *Columbus* to inspect it as being a possible source of an oil slick.[14]

The period between the ship's arrival off New Jersey and actual broadcasting gave McIntire time to reflect on his response to U.S. government efforts to stop his broadcasts. The situation he orchestrated in September 1973 seemed ideal for the Collingswood, New Jersey, minister to combine his desire to use radio to preach his brand of Christianity and at the same time defy the government's broadcasting regulations. The ship represented McIntire's desire to be free to do and say what he wanted on radio and at least to attempt to challenge the U.S. government, in the shape of a regulatory agency which had taken away WXUR. He told the Associated Press, "If the government doesn't watch out, they're going to have a hundred [transmitters on boats] out there. Other groups are going to do the same thing."[15] *Newsweek* quotes him as saying, "Out there, we'll have all the freedom in the world."[16] *Broadcasting* quotes McIntire as saying, ". . . now I'm prepared to defy the courts if they attempt to enjoin me from preaching the Gospel on that boat."[17]

Press reports and federal court documents do not agree on the actual time when transmission of Radio Free America began, although we know the first broadcast took place sometime between 12:23 and 12:40 p.m. on 19 September 1973. With supporters and the press present in the *Columbus* radio studio, the founder of America's only pirate radio ship said, "This is Radio Free America. The silence of the sea is broken at 1160 on the AM dial."[18] The preacher's euphoric style during the day was the obvious result of the fact that he had actually broadcast from the ship and, perhaps more important, he had defied the government. Among the speeches and church music, McIntire gave a running commentary about how he was resisting authority and promoting the word of the Lord. He reminded listeners that, for $15.00, they could come to his radio ship on a charter boat he was arranging. "Folks, we've got a great country and a great system and a great Constitution, don't we? It's the government which is taking away our freedom."[19]

The 10-kilowatt transmitter was effective in reaching listeners. Reception reports came from as far away as Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. However, interference with licensed radio stations also was reported. Because McIntire had made his point and because he did not want to continue to broadcast on the same frequency as licensed stations, his first day of

[12]Reverend Carl McIntire, personal telephone interview, Cape May, New Jersey, September 17, 1973. One of the frequencies, 1613, is just outside the U.S.'s AM band and would probably not have caused interference with other radio stations.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Jules Witcover, "Pirate Radio Ship: Dr. Carl McIntire Challenges FCC With 'Radio Free America,'" *Washington Post*, September 7, 1973, p. A14.

[15]"McIntire's (radio) Ship Comes In," Associated Press dispatch in *The Morning News*, Wilmington, Delaware, August 25, 1973, p. 4.

[16]"The Pirate Preacher," *Newsweek*, September 24, 1973, p. 93.

[17]"Man in the News," p. 22.

[18]Donald Jackson, "F.C.C. Challenged by a 'Pirate' Ship," *New York Times*, September 20, 1973, p. 47.

[19]Rod Nordland, "On Rocky Air Waves: McIntire's Ship Beams One Broadcast," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, September 23, 1973, p. 2D.

programming from Radio Free America was also his last day. Because of documented interference with WHLW in Lakewood, New Jersey, and KSL in Salt Lake City, Utah, he did not transmit on 20 September.

Reaction

On 21 September a federal judge issued a temporary restraining order requiring that broadcasting from *Columbus* be suspended.[20] The ship never resumed transmissions, but the legal battle in federal court lasted eight months.

Both McIntire and Chief Judge Mitchell H. Cohen of the United States District Court, New Jersey, agreed to extend the original temporary restraining order to 1 November 1973 to allow McIntire's lawyers adequate time to prepare a legal case supporting a request to dismiss that order. Lawyers presented five major reasons for the dismissal of the federal court order:

1. The conduct of defendant complained of by the government is not subject to Section 301 of the Communications Act, and cannot be licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.
2. The Geneva Convention of 1959 is not self-executing, and has been legislatively implemented by the United States only in terms of penal enforcement.
3. Equity Jurisdiction of enjoined commission of a criminal offense is extremely limited and reluctantly exercised.
4. The administrative requirements of the Communications Act of 1934 have not been complied with.
5. There has been no showing of irreparable injury.[21]

The final decision on whether the ship's broadcasts fell under FCC jurisdiction was not issued until 19 April 1974, but in the meantime two events took place.

At the request of McIntire, John E. Hunt, Member of Congress from the First District, New Jersey, on the day of Cohen's decision introduced a bill directing the FCC to return to McIntire both WXUR and WXUR-FM until 1 August 1975.[22] The U.S. Congress did not take any action on the bill.

The United States Attorney for New Jersey, two other members of his staff, and four attorneys representing the FCC filed a memorandum supporting the restraining order stopping the broadcasts. The brief filed in Judge Cohen's court documented the relevant sections of the FCC Act of 1934 and the International Tele Communications Convention arguing specifically why the original order was legally proper and should remain in effect.[23] On 25 October 1973, Judge Cohen issued his opinion on McIntire's motion to dismiss the restraining order. His 10-page decision addressed the points noted by McIntire and countered by the FCC and the U.S. Attorney. The judge's decision: "Defendants' motions to dismiss the complaint and dissolve the temporary restraining order are denied."[24]

This was not the end of the legal process involving McIntire and the U.S. government. Cohen's decision contained a footnote referring to the fact that lawyers for Radio Free America had filed a motion to amend their original complaint. The judge, with the agreement of the plaintiffs' lawyers, said that the motion to amend would be heard at a later date.

By the time Judge Cohen issued his 25 October opinion, the radio ship had long departed. The original agreement with the ship's owners for lease involved a 60-day contract with final payment for actual purchase due in mid-October. For both legal and

[20]United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission vs. Reverend Carl McIntire, et al., p. 3.

[21]Ibid., pp. 1–9.

[22]93D Congress, 1st Session, H.R. 11136, A Bill for the relief of Brandywine-Main Line Radio, Incorporated, October 25, 1973, by Mr. Hunt. Also see news release dated 4 November 1973 from Representative Hunt's Washington, D.C., Office.

[23]United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission vs. Reverend Carl McIntire, et al., Civil No. 1367-73, Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs' Complaint for Injunction and in Reply to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Complaint.

[24]United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission vs. Reverend Carl McIntire, Wayne C. Hansen, and Christopher Hansen, Civil Action No. 1367-73, United States Court, District of New Jersey, on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint and Dissolve Temporary Restraining Order, Opinion.

financial reasons, the owners repossessed the ship. Although Radio Free America was no longer waiting off the U.S. coast to broadcast, Dr. McIntire was adamant that the legal battle would continue with the hope that he would be vindicated and that the U.S. government would be embarrassed in light of the information contained in the motion to amend the original brief.

On 18 January 1974,[25] two separate submissions were made in federal court, one by McIntire's team of lawyers and one by his Philadelphia law firm. These were intended to introduce new arguments in addition to those five originally submitted in the attempt to dismiss the temporary restraining order. Judge Cohen's opinion of 25 October 1973 had been extended by agreement of all parties to 1 February 1974. The two legal submissions on 18 January were made with the hope of lifting the temporary restraining order, and to argue against a protective order requested by the government. The move to seek a protective order was based on the request by McIntire's lawyers that documentary materials be obtained by the court from Dean Burch, then Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and from H. R. Haldeman, former assistant to President Nixon. The government responded that McIntire's allegation that the FCC and the White House had conspired to deny the license of WXUR and WXUR-FM had nothing to do with the off-shore radio transmissions. But McIntire's point, the first of two made under "unclean hands," was that,

> Had it not been for the plaintiff's wrongful machinations toward eventual shutting down of WXUR Media, defendant would never have faced the necessity of embarking on the offshore broadcast transmission which the same plaintiff now seeks to enjoin.[26]

The second point was that the U.S. government, through its agencies, had itself broadcast illegally after signing the Geneva Tele Communications Convention and therefore could not bring legal actions against another party accused of the same action. Although not specifically mentioned in the written material submitted to federal court, McIntire was referring to allegations of U.S. military and CIA use of broadcasting from ships and airplanes during the Vietnam conflict.

On 20 February 1974 Judge Cohen issued his opinion on the government's case against McIntire. The opinion made permanent the original temporary restraining order based on the observation that: (1) McIntire did not deny any of the illegal acts of which he is accused, and (2) the doctrine of "unclean hands" is not "available as a defense in this case," because "[the doctrine] will not be permitted to frustrate or thwart the purposes and policies of the laws of the United States."[27]

The final legal action on the case took place on 19 April 1974 when Judge Cohen issued a 1½ page order, the last paragraph of which,

> ORDERED that the defendants, their agents, servants and employees, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, be and they hereby are permanently enjoined from operating radio transmitting equipment on board the vessel *Oceanic*, also called *Columbus*, without a license issued pursuant to Section 301 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. & 3011.[28]

[25]United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission vs. Reverend Carl McIntire, et al., Civil No. 1367-73, Memorandum of Defendant Contra Plaintiff's Motion for a Protective Order; United States of America Federal Communications Commission vs. Carl McIntire, et al., Civil No. 1367-73, Brief of Defendant Contra Plaintiff's Motion for Judgement on the Pleadings.

[26]Memorandum of Defendant Contra Plaintiff's Motion for a Protective Order, p. 8.

[27]United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission vs. Reverend Carl McIntire, Wayne C. Hansen, and Christopher Hansen, Civil No. 1367, Opinion on Plaintiffs; Motion for judgement on the Pleadings, p. 4. While discussing the concept of "unclean hands," Judge Cohen mentions Radio Free Europe as an example of U.S. broadcasting which does not conform to the 1959 Geneva Tele Communications Convention. The Judge's mention of this station is curious because McIntire does not use it, or any other stations, as specific examples in papers submitted to the federal court. Although funded by the CIA until the early 1970s, Radio Free Europe has not broadcast from ships or planes and therefore could not have violated the 1959 treaty.

[28]United States of America and the Federal Communications Commission vs. Reverend Carl McIntire, et al., Civil No. 1367-73, Order signed by Judge Mitchell H. Cohen, filed April 19, 1974, p. 2.

The legal process need not have stopped with the 19 April order; McIntire could have appealed the case as far as the Supreme Court. He did not continue the legal process for several reasons. First, he may have concluded that the government's position in court was a strong one and that eventually his arguments would have been judged to be without legal basis as they had been throughout the period between 21 September 1973 and 19 April 1974. Second, it was too expensive for him to continue federal court litigation. Despite the fact that McIntire had instructed his lawyers on 12 March 1974 to appeal the case to the Court of Appeals for the third Circuit,[29] he later decided not to pursue the appeal. According to Henry Thomas Dolan, who represented his Philadelphia law firm, "His decision was in part based on economic considerations, that is, he felt ultimately he would make more progress toward accomplishment of his objectives by employing his financial resources in channels other than active litigations in courts."[30]

Should Dr. McIntire's action be seen as a brave man's effort to establish his constitutional rights, or as the perverse reaction of an egocentric, autocratic religious bigot? Clearly, the effort and money Carl McIntire expended to broadcast from international waters are the most drastic steps an American has taken as the result of the loss of a broadcasting license.

The saga of Radio Free America has no real similarity to the former European offshore pirate radio operators. McIntire did not have financial remuneration as his primary motive; he was not battling a powerful public service-oriented body such as the British Broadcasting Corporation; he apparently had little or no support from listeners. Finally, unlike the initial reaction of European governments to pirate broadcasters, the U.S. government took immediate legal action against a citizen transmitting from a ship.

One is tempted to speculate about a possible alternative outcome if he had changed two decisions before broadcasting. First, those licensed stations in New Jersey and Utah would not have objected if he had broadcast on a frequency just outside the designated AM band. If 1613 kHz had been used, no interference could have been charged by stations. Second, McIntire's decision to use a U.S.-registered ship made him subject to U.S. maritime laws. Had the ship been foreign-registered, diplomatic efforts would have been necessary, thus involving the State Department. The overall picture of the events which transpired and the eventual outcome would not have changed. Eventually, the U.S. government would have found a legal means of silencing the radio ship as European governments had done to their pirates.

Epilogue

Carl McIntire continues to host the "Twentieth Century Reformation Hour" daily although it is no longer an hour and is carried live and via tape from a limited number of radio stations. He is still the pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church in Collingswood, New Jersey. Now in his mid-70s, he has embarked on another media venture. Taking a cue from those involved in what has become known as the electronic church, McIntire tapes a weekly television show in Red Lion, Pennsylvania, which is distributed via video cassettes to an undisclosed number of cable systems in the U.S.[31] He will not, however, have the impact or the reach of Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, or Jim Bakker's television ministries. They are of another generation, use sophisticated marketing and production techniques, and are unlikely to confront the U.S. government by broadcasting illegally.

[29]Henry Thomas Dolan, partner, Fein, Criden, Johanson, Dolan & Morrissey, P. C., personal letter to the writer, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 13, 1974.

[30]Henry Thomas Dolan, partner, Fein, Criden, Johanson, Dolan & Morrissey, P. C., personal letter to the writer, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, July 22, 1974.

[31]Reverend Carl McIntire, pastor, Bible Presbyterian Church, Collingswood, N.J., personal telephone interview, September 17, 1982.

CSSJ INFORMATION FILE ON CONFERENCES, CONVENTIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS

[*Editor's Note:* Send items of notice directly to the Editor. When we have room, we will be pleased to run them if we can with enough lead time.]

PENN STATE CONFERENCE ON RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

Wayne Booth, Peter Elbow, and James Kinneavy will be the major consultants at the third Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition, to be held July 10–13, 1984, at State College, Pennsylvania. Featured speakers will include Lester Faigley, Michael Halloran, and Janice Redish. People interested in participating are invited to submit papers, demonstrations, or workshops on topics related to rhetoric or the teaching of writing. One-page proposals will be accepted until April 15. If you wish to propose or volunteer to chair sessions, or if you are interested in more information, write to Professor Jack Selzer, Department of English, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PEACEMAKING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is the site of the 1984 National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution, September 20–23, with a series of pre-conference training workshops offered September 18–20. The conference encourages practitioners, researchers, and teachers involved in all forms of peacemaking and conflict intervention to explore a series of issues critical to the emergence and growth of the field. For further information, write to one of the program committee's co-chairs: Margaret S. Herrman, Institute of Government, 321 Academic Building, University of Georgia, GA 30602; or James H. Laue, Center for Metropolitan Studies, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63121.

IPA'S ORATORS HALL OF FAME

The International Platform Association, which traces itself back to The American Lyceum Association (1831), has now completed its 1983 ballotting, and has inducted five new members into the Orator's Hall of Fame. Inducted were John F. Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, Abba Eban, Douglas MacArthur, and William Jennings Bryan. They joined 1982's "five best orators in history," Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Martin Luther King, Jr.

The President and Membership Chairman of the IPA currently is Dr. Glenn Seaborg. Anyone interested in membership in or the activities of the IPA may contact Ms. Shirlee Friedenberg, Ernest Wittenberg Associates, Inc., 1616 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.